DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 275	CE 008 681
AUTHOR	Nehnevajsa, Jiri; Karelitz, Ann P.
TITLE	Patterns of Volunteering Activities in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. Center for Urban Research.
SPONS AGENCY	ACTION, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 76
CONTRACT	75-043-1047
NOTE	227p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-\$0.83 HC-\$12.71 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Activities; *Behavior Patterns; Community Surveys; Demography; *Metropolitan Areas; *Motivation; National Surveys; Religious Factors; Social Work; Statistical Surveys; Urban Areas; Voluntary Agencies; *Volunteers; Work Attitudes; Work Experience; Working Hours
IDENTIFIERS	United States

ABSTRACT

This analysis of a 1974 ACTION-sponsored Bureau of Census survey of the extent of volunteer activity in the United States opens with the observation that some 37,000,000 Americans did volunteer work in 1974, an increase of 18% to 24% since 1965. Chapter headings are (1) Alternative Outcomes: Some Implications, (2) Volunteering Roles and Hours, (3) Frequency of Volunteering, (4) Volunteering in Religious Activities, (5) Time of First Volunteering, (6) Reasons for Initial Non-Religious Volunteering, (7) Plans to Continue Volunteering, (8) Reasons for Continued Volunteering, (9) Unactualized Volunteering Intentions, (10) A Sample Trade-Off Analysis, (11) One Week's Volunteers, (12) One Week's Activities, (13) Some Major Configurations, and (14) Summary and Implications. Statistical tables, charts, and graphs are included. (WL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131275

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Patterns of Volunteering Activities
in
Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

By

Jiri Nehnevajsa

and

Ann P. Karelitz

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

June, 1976

CENTER FOR URBAN RESEARCH

CE 008 681

CE 008 681

ACTION Contract No. 75-043-1047

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION....................................1

II. ALTERNATIVE OUTCOMES: SOME IMPLICATIONS.....10

III. VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS..............17

IV. FREQUENCY OF VOLUNTEERING.................26

V. VOLUNTEERS IN RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES..........35

VI. TIME OF FIRST VOLUNTEERING................41

VII. REASONS FOR INITIAL NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING.....48

VIII. PLANS TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING..........63

IX. REASONS FOR CONTINUED VOLUNTEERING........72

X. UNACTUALIZED VOLUNTEERING INTENTIONS........86

XI. A SIMPLE TRADE-OFF ANALYSIS...............98

XII. ONE WEEK'S VOLUNTEERS...................106

XIII. ONE WEEK'S ACTIVITIES..................119

XIV. SOME MAJOR CONFIGURATIONS...............125

XV. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS.................151

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1 Frequency of Volunteer Work: May, 1973 to April, 1974..............1

2 Hours of Volunteering Work During the Year Prior to April, 1974..............2

3 Period in Which First Non-Religious Volunteer Work Was Done..............3

4 Reasons for First Non-Religious Volunteering and Reasons for Continuing Voluntary Work Beyond April, 1974..............4

5 Reasons for Not Continuing Voluntary Work Beyond April, 1974 Among Those Who Had Volunteering During the Year 1973-1974..............5

6 Volunteer Activities Considered by 1973-1974 Non-Volunteers..............6

7 Type of Organizational Context of the Week's Voluntary Activity..............7

8 Volunteering Rates and Hours in 106 SMSA'S..............18

9 SMSA'S With High Variability in Volunteering Rates and in Hours Per Volunteer..............25

10 Volunteering Frequency in SMSA'S With at Least 30 Volunteers During 1973-1974..............28

11 Average Hours of Volunteering for Each Time of Volunteering for SMSA'S With 30 or More Volunteers During the Year..............30

12 Volunteering Frequency and Rates and Hours Rank-Order Correlations (30 SMSA's)..............31

13 Average Hours, Average Volunteering Occasions, and Average Hours Per Volunteering Occasion on the Part of Regular and Occasional Volunteers..............32

14 Percentages of Those Who Did Volunteer for Religious Activities Only..............36

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE

15 Rank Correlations for 30 SMSA's Between Religious Volunteering Rate, Overall Rate, Average Hours and Average Annual Frequencies....37

16 Volunteering Hours, Yearly Occasions and Average Hours Per Occasion for Religious-Only Volunteers and for Other Volunteers....38

17 Time of First Non-Religious Voluntary Activity....43

18 Volunteering Hours, Annual Frequencies and Average Hours Per Volunteering Occasion Dependent on Time of Initial Non-Religious Volunteering....45

19 Reasons for First Non-Religious Volunteering Activity....49

20 Average Annual Volunteering Hours by Reasons for First Non-Religious Activity....52

21 Reasons for First Non-Religious Volunteering and Annual Frequency of Voluntary Activities....55

22 Average Hours of Volunteering Per Each Annual Volunteering Occasion by Reasons for First Non-Religious Involvement....58

23 Response Patterns in Each of 30 SMSA's: by Reasons for Initial Volunteering....60

24 Rank-Order Correlations for 30 SMSA's: Percentages of Volunteers (By Reason), Annual Hours (By Reason), and Annual Frequencies (By Reason)....62

25 Percentages of 1973-1974 Volunteers Who Plan to Continue Volunteering....64

26 Reasons for Not Planning to Continue Volunteering Beyond April, 1974....70

27 Reasons for Plans to Continue Voluntary Activity....73

28 Rank-Order Correlations of 30 SMSA's by Initial Reasons and by Reasons for Continuation....75

29 Rank-Order Correlations of 30 SMSA's by Percentage Planning to Continue and Reasons Given for Ongoing Volunteering....76

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE

30 Average Volunteering Hours, 1973-1974, for Those Who Plan to Continue Volunteering and by Reasons for Continued Activity....77

31 Annual Volunteering Frequencies for Those Who Planned to Continue Volunteering by Reasons for Continued Activity....80

32 Average Hours Per Volunteering Occasion on the Part of Those Who Have Plans to Continue Volunteering and by Reasons for Continued Involvement....82

33 Rank-Order Correlations for 30 SMSA's Between Annual Volunteering Hours and Annual Volunteering Frequencies for Those Who Plan to Continue Volunteering and Who Have Given Specified Reasons for Continued Activity....84

34 Those Who Considered Volunteering But Did Not (1973-1974)....87

35 Correlations of Percentages of Those Who Considered Volunteering and Percentages of Active Volunteers and Hours Spent Volunteering During the Year (106 SMSA's)....93

36 Types of Activity Contexts Considered by Those Who Thought They Might Volunteer But Didn't (National, Identified SMSA's, Other Areas)....94

37 Organizational Contexts for Which 1973-1974 Non-Volunteers Considered Volunteering....96

38 1973-1974 Volunteering in 106 SMSA's and Estimated Volunteering for 1974-1975....100

39 Percentages of Volunteers and Average Hours Per Volunteer During the Week of April 7 Through April 13, 1974....107

40 Volunteering Rates and Hours in April Week of 1974 and Estimates of Rates and Hours for a Typical Week Based on Implications of the Full Year's Data....115

41 Main Activities of Those Who Volunteered During the Week of April 7 Through 13, 1974....121

42 Estimates of Religious and Health-Related Volunteering Based on Intentions (Table 37) and on Actual Activities Between April 7 and 13, 1974....123

43 Variables Explicitly Considered in the Report and National Averages on These Variables....126

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE

44 Ranking of 30 Large SMSA's on Volunteering Rates, and Hours and Both Rates and Hours (From High to Low)....................134

45 Configurations of Volunteering Behavior in SMSA's With Higher Both Rates and Hours....................................145

46 Configurations of Volunteering Behavior in SMSA's With Lower Both Rates and Hours.....................................147

I. INTRODUCTION

During the year which ended in April, 1974, some 37,000,000 Americans, aged over 13 years, gave some of their time and effort to help others. They did unpaid work. They served as volunteers.[1]

Compared with 1965, some nine years prior to the results obtained in the ACTION-sponsored Bureau of Census survey which, in 1974, had encompassed a national sample of 23,371, this represents an increase in volunteering rates from about 18 percent to 24 percent.[2]

Many volunteers were involved in their particular projects at least once a week - a modal pattern of volunteering. Table 1 gives the national percentages for those who, in the total sample of 23,731 reported having done voluntary work in the year prior to April, 1974.

Table 1

FREQUENCY OF VOLUNTEER WORK: MAY, 1973 TO APRIL, 1974*

	Percent [N=5,627]
Once a week	36.0
Once every two weeks	10.0
Once a month	14.0
Only a few times	22.0
Only once	7.0
Other	11.0

*Americans Volunteer, 1974, ACTION, Washington, D.C. February, 1975, especially Table 3, p. 25, Appendix C. The results, as reported by ACTION, were rounded here to the nearest percentage.

The respondents were also asked how much time, in estimated hours, they had spent over the year in their voluntary activities.

The ACTION instrument provided for categorization of the answers, as in Table 2, with provisions for an actual self-assessment of hours spent for those who claimed to have spent in excess of 300 hours.

Table 2

HOURS OF VOLUNTEERING WORK DURING
THE YEAR PRIOR TO APRIL, 1974*

	Percent
Less than 25 hours	37.0
25 to 99 hours	34.0
100 to 299 hours	21.0
Over 299 hours	7.0

*Derived from op. cit. Table 4, Appendix C.
**Totals to 99% due to rounding off of percentages.

If we use the midpoint of each of the structured categories: that is, 12 hours for those who did more than zero volunteering but less than 25 hours, 62 hours for those whose responses fell into the 25 to 99 hours bracket, 200 hours for those between 100 and 299, and the actual average for those with 300 hours or more of effort (this actual average amounting to 558 hours for each of the 7 percent of volunteers in the category), the data of Table 2 (Americans Volunteer, 1974, op. cit. Table 4 of Appendix) imply a national average of 108.0 hours per volunteer, or just about 2.1 hours per week.

About 18 percent of all the volunteers had reported only religious work; the remaining respondents may have been also involved, as they were, in religious volunteering but, in addition to that, they also had participated in other types of activities.[3]

A large plurality of the 1974 volunteers recalled having engaged in their first non-religious volunteering relatively recently - since about 1970. Table 3 sums up the ACTION data.

Even though the explication of reasons for having first volunteered in a non-religious activity was somewhat constrained by the response categories which were open to the respondents, they provided us with a good insight into the basic patterns.[4]

Table 3

PERIOD IN WHICH FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEER WORK WAS DONE*

	Percent
1970 - 1974	46.0
1965 - 1969	16.0
1960 - 1964	12.0
1950 - 1959	13.0
Before 1950	12.0

*Americans Volunteer, op. cit., p. 26, from Table 6, Appendix C.

**Percentages total 99% due to rounding.

Furthermore, the basic thrust of the subjectively felt rationale is underscored among those, some 85 percent of all 1973-1974 volunteers, who intended to continue their activities (or else, who planned to continue volunteering beyond April, 1974, even though possibly in other activities).[5]

Table 4 contains the self-stated reasons for initial voluntary involvement as well as for willingness, and intention, to continue.

Altruistic reasons - and we have no grounds on which to suspect the sincerity of the respondents and, in fact, good evidence to substantiate it[6] - are given as the dominant reaction both to initial (non-religious) involvement as well as to continuation of voluntary work. But "enjoyment" of the activity itself is, in relative terms, even more important than the desire to help others as a factor in the plans to continue (with 13 percent more respondents citing it as a crucial factor in continuation of activity than as an original reason).

Of course, some 15 percent of all pre-April, 1974, volunteers thought that they would not continue in their activities. Table 5, paralleling Table 10 in Appendix C of Americans Volunteer 1974, gives the national pattern.

Time problems, activity termination and entry into a paying job were cited as main factors affecting discontinuation of volunteering. There is, of course, no way of telling how many of these respondents

Table 4

REASONS FOR FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING AND REASONS FOR CONTINUING VOLUNTARY WORK BEYOND APRIL, 1974*

	Initial Volunteering Percent***	Continued Volunteering** Percent***
Wanted to help people	53.0	60.0
Enjoyed volunteer work	36.0	49.0
Sense of duty	32.0	38.0
Child in program	22.0	16.0
Couldn't refuse when asked	15.0	11.0
Had nothing else to do	4.0	2.0
Hoped it would lead to a paying job	3.0	2.0
Other	--	6.0

*From Tables 7 and 9, Appendix, C, op. cit. pp. 26-27.

**85 percent of all who had done voluntary work, 1973-1974, is the percentage base (N=4,755).

***More than 100 percent in all because of multiple responses by a number of interviewees.

may resume volunteering when time again allows it, when another project crops up that may be of interest to them, or when they get "settled" on their newly acquired paying job.

Some 6 percent of all respondents who did not recall any voluntary work during the year prior to April 1974 "considered" volunteering.[7] They did not, however, volunteer. In Table 6, the types of activities which were considered are summarized. Health-related work was by far most frequently mentioned (by 32 percent of those who considered volunteering) with about one in ten of these respondents claiming to have thought about volunteering in religious, social and welfare activities, in recreational ones, and in those which may be classified as "citizenship" efforts (scout leadership, Veterans of Foreign Wars activities and the like).

Table 5

REASONS FOR NOT CONTINUING VOLUNTARY WORK BEYOND APRIL, 1974, AMONG THOSE WHO HAD VOLUNTEERED DURING THE YEAR 1973-1974

	Percent
Too busy, not enough time*	24.0
Project ended	20.0
Respondent got paying job	13.0
Loss of interest*	8.0
Moved away	9.0
Health, age reasons*	7.0
Child no longer in program	5.0
Nothing useful to do	4.0
Looking for a paying job*	2.0
No personal rewards	2.0
Poor supervision	1.0
Miscellaneous**	13.0

*Asterisked items were classified as "other reasons" in Table 10, Appendix C, Americans Volunteer 1974.

**"Miscellaneous" here includes reasons still "other" than those asterisked ones. It is categorized as "other" in the tabulation of "Other" than the main postulated reasons in the ACTION report and appears at the bottom of Table 10.

Unfortunately, the national study does not reveal why people may not have considered volunteering at all. But from those who did give it some thought, we learn something about the reasons for not having made an actual decision to volunteer and for not having, as a matter of fact, volunteered. The respondents, by far most often, became "too busy with other things" (44 percent of them), or were too busy already (9 percent), or had family responsibilities - generally, the need to take care of children (12 percent), had health problems or became pregnant (6 percent), and the like.[8]

Some (5 percent) lost interest in the project they had considered; some thought the transportation costs associated with the activity would be prohibitive (4 percent) or, in fact, had no means

Table 6

VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED BY 1973-1974 NON-VOLUNTEERS*

	Percent
Health	32.0
Religious	11.0
Social/Welfare	10.0
Recreational	10.0
Citizenship	8.0
Educational	7.0
Civic and Community Action	7.0
Political	4.0
Justice	1.0
Other	9.0

*Data from Table 15, p. 30, Appendix C, Americans Volunteer 1974, op. cit.

of transportation readily available (2 percent) or, for that matter, moved away from the community where they had considered becoming involved in volunteering (3 percent).

Of those who did volunteer any time during the year (and many, of course, reported volunteering on a weekly basis, or at least every two weeks), some 42 percent claimed to have been engaged in voluntary work during the week of April 7 through 13, 1974 - the week immediately anteceding the Bureau of Census data collection in the nationwide ACTION study.[9]

This turned out to be the week of Passover (April 7) and of Easter (April 14); thus the 50 percent who had done religious volunteering during that particular week may represent some slight effect of the significance of the period to both Jews and Christians.[10] Table 7 provides a summary of the data for "last week's" volunteering by activity type.

All in all then, the results imply 1.32 activities for each of the respondents who had done voluntary work during the April 7 - 13, 1974, period. Overall, the effort averaged about 9 hours per volunteer during the week.[11]

Table 7

TYPE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT OF THE WEEK'S VOLUNTARY ACTIVITY*

	Percent
Religious	50.0
Health	15.0
Education	15.0
Civic/Community Action	14.0
Citizenship	12.0
Recreation	11.0
Social/Welfare	7.0
Political	3.0
Justice	1.0
Other	4.0

*Table 17, Appendix C of Americans Volunteer 1974 is the the source here.

With the nationwide results, at this highest level of aggregation, as a backdrop, we may now consider the act of volunteering in a somewhat different perspective.

Where, in fact, do Americans make choices to volunteer and where, furthermore, do they perform the voluntary work to which they become committed? Both choice and behavior patterns, whatever else may be said about them, are tied to name-places. They occur in one's community or in communities near the volunteer's place of residence or place of work.

Trivial though it may seem, an important conclusion needs to be emphasized: potential, or actual, volunteers who live, say, in Miami or in the area surrounding Miami do not do their voluntary work in Tampa, or Jacksonville, not to speak of Denver or Seattle.

Indeed, volunteers from an area will, with minor exceptions, do their volunteering within, rather than outside of, that area. The exceptions, too, are relatively simple to identify: they are likely to occur around the periphery of an area however it, in turn, may be geographically delineated. In other words, the behavior of people is not altogether constrained by administrative or political boundaries. Some inhabitants of a city, say those who live within the municipal boundaries of the City of Pittsburgh, may well "spill over" as volunteers into non-city areas. In reverse, some inhabitants of the non-city area surrounding Pittsburgh - and that area happens to be Allegheny County - may do a great deal of their shopping, working, recreating, entertaining and volunteering within the city itself. Those who live in the northern areas of Allegheny County will most likely find the focal region of their activities within the County. But some will undertake various activities, including volunteering, in the City, and some may find themselves helping in Beaver County (Northwest of Allegheny, and part of the Pittsburgh SMSA), or in Butler County (North of Allegheny County and not part of the SMSA), or in Armstrong and, possibly, Lawrence Counties (neither being part of the Pittsburgh SMSA).

Yet, all these are relatively adjacent areas, and common sense, requiring in this instance no "research confirmation," makes the argument plausible that almost all relevant actions of almost all the area's inhabitants are confined to that area and to areas "nearby."

The same, of course, holds for the "pools" of people from among whom volunteers come, or additional ones might be mobilized. The VAC Director, for instance, in Erie, Pennsylvania, cannot count on getting volunteer help from residents of Buffalo, New York even though the travel distance is not that prohibitive. Indeed, the Director would not base any plans on the odds that people might be attracted to Erie from Buffalo, Cleveland, or Pittsburgh. Nor will the Director base any estimates on the expectation that actual, or potential, residents of the Erie area will not do voluntary work in Erie but will begin traveling to Pittsburgh, Cleveland or Buffalo to give of their time and effort.

Furthermore, the needs for volunteers are also localized ones. It may be true that there are never enough volunteers, but it is also likely to hold that the different magnitudes and patternings of needs, and variable visibility to the community of such needs, affect the characteristics of the pool from which help can, or might, be drawn.

Nor will it help the Seattle VAC to know that there are more volunteers than would be essentially needed in Denver, Colorado. Denver "surplus" cannot be used up to produce a Seattle "balance" between need (demand) and availability (supply).

Despite its obviousness, once stated, the strategic nature of our point justifies our lengthier elaboration of it. Volunteering behavior is local behavior. The needs for volunteers are local (even when tied to national organizations and nationwide concerns, or, in fact, global ones). The volunteer pools are local pools.

It is precisely for these reasons that we have chosen, as our central analytic thrust, maximum feasible disaggregation of the national results that is in keeping with the concept of localization of volunteering. The Bureau of Census data tapes on ACTION's 1974 survey make it possible to disaggregate the results at the level of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas at most.

When we say that the tapes "make this possible," as a limit, merely means that information which would permit even further disaggregation (for instance, by SMSA Central Ctiy versus the rest of the SMSA and the like) is not available on the file (and considerations of privacy protection have, of course, dictated that choice on the part of the Census Bureau). In simple terms: this is as far as we can go in attempting to localize the volunteering behavior which is, in reality, local behavior.

Now we pose the following question:

How much variation, if any at all, is there in the patterns of volunteering among the nation's SMSA's?

It should be clear now why we began our discussion by providing highlights of the national aggregated pattern: it becomes sort of a standard, a norm, an anchorage in terms of which variability, such as may exist, can be considered in the bodies of more disaggregated data.

The scope of this aspect of our analysis is, therefore, limited to addressing the question posed, thereby delineating variability in volunteering behavior among the nation's SMSA's given the national pattern.

II. ALTERNATIVE OUTCOMES: SOME IMPLICATIONS

If we were formally proposing hypotheses, then the "anchorage" perspective on the national results makes it self-evident what our null hypothesis would have to be: the national volunteering pattern is "reproduced" throughout the SMSA's.

In turn, the alternative would be that the pattern is not so reproduced: that variability around the national result exists, that it is real (at least in a statistical sense), and that it is important (in national as well as local policy sense).

Actually, the formulating of alternatives to the null hypothesis would be theoretically much more demanding unless we were to settle merely for positing the "no-difference" versus "difference" options (as above).

We might want to formulate alternative hypotheses in light of theoretical conceptualizations which have their roots in urban economics, political science and sociology. We might then be proposing that SMSA's with particular theoretically derived, and empirically established, characteristics would be different from other SMSA's and, of necessity, from the national pattern.

We did not take this route of formal hypotheses derivation and testing. Rather, we postulated the null hypothesis (that the pattern of volunteering across SMSA's is statistically like that of the nation as a whole), but went into a process of discovery beyond that. Instead of saying, as an alternative, "we expect variability among the SMSA's due to the following factors," we said: let us first determine the extent to which variability exists; then, how and whether we can account for it in terms of the data; then, if we can account for some part of it (or all of it!), what does it mean to national as well as local policy. As a result, we are apt to end with hypotheses, though grounded in solid evidence, rather than begin with them. We are, so to say, searching rather than testing.

In this context then, there are only two major outcomes:

*the volunteering pattern throughout the SMSA's is like that of the nation as a whole,

*the volunteering pattern among the SMSA's displays variability such that cannot be statistically, or in policy-sense, or in both terms, reduced to "sampling" fluctuations.

This, of course, forces us to reiterate what we have done implicitly before: what are the components of this "volunteering pattern?" Which variables, in fact, are to be considered?

To assess the extent of SMSA variability around the national pattern, we shall utilize precisely those variables which we had given a summary of in light of the nationwide results as reported by ACTION. That is:

1. The volunteering rate during the year prior to the study (May, 1973 through April, 1974).
2. The amount of time (in hours) which volunteers claimed to have spent during the year.
3. The frequency (per year) with which they engaged in voluntary activities.
4. The percentage of volunteers who have done only religious work.
5. The time period during which volunteers who did also other than religious work had initially engaged in their first "non-religious" activity.
6. The self-assessed "reasons" for getting involved as volunteers in their first non-religious activity.
7. The plans of the 1973-1974 volunteers to continue volunteering beyond April, 1974.
8. The reasons for their willingness, or desire, to continue.
9. The reasons for not continuing, on the part of those who did not expect to keep on volunteering beyond April, 1974.
10. The people who, not having volunteered in 1973-1974, considered doing so.
11. The type of activity that they considered.
12. The reasons for their actually not having decided to volunteer and for not having done the work they had considered.

13. The volunteers who did some voluntary work during the week prior to the Bureau of the Census Study (April 7 through April 13, 1974).
14. The types of organizations for which they worked, given that they did do volunteering during the week antecedant to the study by ACTION.
15. The amount of time, both overall and per activity which was spent during the week before the ACTION/Bureau of Census study was in the field.

In this report then, our definition of "volunteering pattern" encompasses these fifteen variables. The question about SMSA variability, if any, is raised with regard to each of these measures, as well as to the basic configuration involved.

The key outcomes, of course, when the national results are used as a "norm" are, roughtly, as follows:

a. No significant SMSA variability around the national norm among the SMSA's.
b. No significant variability in terms of most of the variables, but significant variability on some of them.
c. No significant variability for a few of the variables (or some of them), but very significant SMSA variation for most of them.
d. Significant variability among the SMSA's on (almost) all the variables.

Having completed the research, we know the results. However, consider the basic issues as they are in the absence of any subsequent knowledge (or discovery).

There are several levels of implications with which we can be concerned. Two of these are of paramount importance: implications for ACTION, in its planning and policy development endeavors, and implications for locals, the VAC (or equivalent organization) Director and staff members.

Suppose a., as an outcome, is true. Thus, the local situation (as the SMSA disaggregation level) across the nation parallels the nation (and, by definition, all SMSA's are pretty much alike).

For ACTION, this would suggest:

1. The cost (human as well as fiscal) to mobilize, sustain, and use volunteers is about equal on a per volunteer basis across the country, so that budget and manpower allocations should be about the same throughout the country and a similar kind of volunteer rate and hour pay-off can be expected.
2. The same policies of volunteer mobilization, recruitment and use have approximately equal applicability across the country, so that national "standardization" is not only possible, not only easy, not only desirable, but also effective.
3. Characteristics of local VAC, the staff members, their organizational structure, their linkages within the communities, their budgets, are not important factors in determining volunteering behavior in the various urbanized areas of the nation.
4. Characteristics of the community setting itself (the ambience of the SMSA) are not important as determinants in mobilizability, recruitability, usability and effectiveness of volunteers.

For the local centers, VAC's or equivalents, such results have the following strategic implications:

1. "Standardized" national approaches to volunteering can be utilized with success probabilities equal to those of any other national area.
2. Experiences, approaches, and procedures of any other VAC can be used in mobilizing, recruiting and using volunteers and the results will be just about the same (including the continued use of one's own approach).
3. A given, extant, local organization as it functions, given the qualifications of its personnel, given its methods, is as good as other organizations, other staff and personnel qualifications, and other methods might be because it yields essentially the same results at the output level.
4. Funding support and manpower support could, or should, be allocated on an equality basis among the various locals (of course, perhaps scaled relative to population of the area)

because all do just about equally well with the resources which they have: by implication, if unequal resource allocations already exist, they remain justified because equal results are obtained with given (hitherto provided) resources.

Let us suppose now that d. as a result of our analysis should prove to hold more than the alternatives. Thus the local situations display wide variation around the national "norm."

For ACTION, this would imply:

1. Variable cost, human as well as fiscal, of mobilizing, sustaining and using volunteers so that budget and manpower allocations must reflect a choice of criteria, in some appropriate mix, rather than "equality" as a norm:
   *whether to maintain (and increase) volunteering strenth where it exists,
   *whether to increase volunteering potential in areas where volunteering is weak,
   *whether to amintain current patterns of resource allocations, and current policies either
      **because the extant volunteering geography is acceptable, or
      **because there are secular trends indicating the possibility of increasing volunteering in currently deficient areas and sustaining volunteering in currently high activity areas.
2. Policies and approaches cannot be easily "standardized." They can be, at best, guidelines with recommendations for appropriate more localized adaptations.
3. Possible changes in VAC's, applying lessons of "more successful" to "less successful" areas, might be given an appropriate consideration once research should indicate the VAC-or-equivalent factors which relate more to "success" and those which relate more to "less-than-success" (if not "failure").
4. The volunteering need patterns, the volunteer pools, the characteristics of the community may account for the variability and some of these factors land themselves to appropriate

social, economic and political interventions. Thus, such interventions could "strengthen" weaker areas or "sustain," or further "enhance," weaker volunteering areas once the appropriate intervention levers and their dynamics were understood.

For local volunteer action coordinators, the outcome would imply, among others, the following:

1. "Standardized" approaches across the nation are not most appropriate. One should learn from the methods, procedures and approaches of the "more" successful settings and experiment with them.
2. Different approaches may be needed due to the variability in needs, volunteer pool, and actual current composition of the volunteer force, and different ways to mobilize such volunteers as may be needed would be given a high priority.
3. The local VAC or equivalent may require more detailed local information on which to base expansion plans, or on which to insure that current volunteering rates and time commitments are, at the minimum, sustained.

In a similar manner, we could analyze some of the main implications of the mixed outcomes in which some of the factors are, and some are not, significant in their variability around the national norm.

However, there are many variables included in the volunteering pattern and, therfore, many possible mixes, each with a somewhat different subset of more specific policy ramifications. Therefore, we shall postpone this discussion.

Rather, we will now present the disaggregated results (at the SMSA level) and then return to the implications of the actual empirical results both for ACTION and for the local organizations which seek to nourish voluntarism. We shall consider the variables sequentially, and in the several central configurations.

Furthermore, in this initial exposition, we will entirely ignore two clusters of factors which we must, of course, return to: the characteristics of the SMSA's themselves, and the characteristics of the volunteers.

In these terms then, our immediate problem is reduced to a relatively simple presentation of the results in regard to variability of SMSA volunteering patterns with respect to the national standards which we had chosen to summarize in the introductory discussion.

III. VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS: 1973-1974

Of the 23,731 respondents in the national 1974 study, 12,768 (or 53.8 percent) reside in identifiable Standard Metropolitan Areas.[12] In all, this includes 106 SMSA's and, for the most part, the largest ones. Thus for our immediate purposes, respondents from non-SMSA's or SMSA's other than those identified here, 106 in all, will be simply disregarded.

Table 8 provides the data on percentages of volunteers during the year prior to April, 1974, and the average hours each such volunteer had spent on the individual's respective projects during the year.

The immediate conclusion is clear and sharp: there is great variability among the SMSA's both in rates and hours--hence, outcome d. of our previous discussion is most appropriate.

With regard to volunteering hours, the range of variation goes from 8.0 percent (Miami) to 45.8 percent (Mobile, Alabama). A factor of 5.7 is obviously implied.

Admittedly, the subsample size in Mobile is very small (N=24) so that the result could be simply an artifact of sampling fluctuation rather than of real differences in volunteering. Yet, Seattle SMSA, with a subsample of N=162 (and Miami, with its N=176) has volunteering rates of 40.1 percent, five times that of Miami.

New York SMSA volunteers[13] (with N=923) amount to 12.2 percent. Those in St. Louis (N=274), to 35.0 percent.

The variations are undoubtedly real as they are important at least as far as percentages of those who volunteered during the 1973-1974 year are concerned.

The story with regard to average hours per volunteer is not different. If anything, the variability is even greater. Thus we find an extreme of 392.7 hours in Salinas-Monterey (but with only 14 respondents--and thus a volatile result), and another extreme of 19.1 hours per volunteer in Wilkes Barre (with only 45 respondents). This implies, of course, a factor of 20.6 in terms of these polar differences.

Table 8

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN 106 SMSA'S

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT VOLUNTEERING	HOURS PER VOLUNTEER	$[N_{VOL}]$	[N]
Akron	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	31.1	151.9	19	61
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	New York	MA	E	II	34.7	188.4	26	75
*Anaheim-Santa Anna-Garden Grove	California	P	W	IX	33.0	82.8	62	188
Appleton-Oshkosh	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	25.7	38.4	9	35
*Atlanta	Georgia	SA	S	IV	27.8	108.4	49	176
Austin	Texas	WSC	S	VI	20.0	32.0	5	25
Bakersfield	California	P	W	IX	14.3	99.7	6	42
*Baltimore	Maryland	SA	S	IV	23.1	123.3	52	225
Baton Rouge	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	38.9	143.7	14	36
Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange	Texas	WSC	S	VI	35.7	32.0	5	14
Birmingham	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	20.5	78.7	17	83
*Boston	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	15.9	116.7	49	308
Bridgeport	Connecticut	NE	E	I	21.5	89.8	14	65
*Buffalo	New York	MA	E	III	28.7	89.1	43	150
Canton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	19.2	27.0	10	52
Charleston	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	21.2	19.1	7	33
Charlotte	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	29.9	107.4	23	77

Table 8 (Continued)

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN 106 SMSA'S

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT VOLUNTEERING	HOURS PER VOLUNTEER	$[N_{VOL}]$	$[N]$
*Chicago	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	19.0	103.3	145	763
*Cleveland	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	17.6	106.0	34	193
Columbia	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	16.7	86.7	12	72
*Columbus	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	25.6	72.1	30	117
Corpus Christi	Texas	WSC	S	VI	41.7	55.8	10	24
*Dallas	Texas	WSC	S	VI	23.2	157.5	51	220
Dayton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	27.9	118.6	17	61
*Denver	Colorado	RM	W	VIII	35.5	77.2	49	138
Des Moines	Iowa	WNC	NC	VII	41.7	42.0	15	36
*Detroit	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	23.6	90.6	102	432
El Paso	Texas	WSC	S	VI	37.5	152.8	15	40
Erie	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	27.0	59.6	10	37
Flint	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	20.3	71.5	12	59
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood	Florida	SA	S	IV	21.8	156.2	19	87
Fort Wayne	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	27.3	66.2	9	33
Fort Worth	Texas	WSC	S	VI	18.9	106.0	17	90
Fresno	California	P	W	IX	17.3	51.3	14	81
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	14.9	91.6	10	67

Table 8 (Continued)

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN 106 SMSA'S

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT VOLUNTEERING	HOURS PER VOLUNTEER	$[N_{VOL}]$	$[N]$
Grand Rapids	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	20.3	134.7	14	69
High Point	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	26.2	101.8	21	80
Greenville	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	13.5	134.8	5	37
Harrisburg	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	25.3	120.2	19	75
Hartford	Connecticut	NE	E	I	10.8	150.8	7	65
Honolulu	Hawaii	P	W	IX	10.9	106.0	6	55
*Houston	Texas	WSC	S	VI	14.2	91.9	37	260
*Indianapolis	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	39.3	93.8	53	135
Jackson	Mississippi	ESC	S	IV	17.6	45.3	6	34
Jacksonville	Florida	SA	S	IV	25.5	106.4	14	55
Jersey City	New Jersey	MA	E	II	13.3	130.3	6	45
Johnstown	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	31.8	26.3	7	22
*Kansas City	Missouri-Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	28.2	95.4	42	149
Knoxville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	22.2	124.2	20	90
Lancaster	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	36.0	113.7	18	50
Lansing	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	17.3	60.7	9	52
Little Rock-North Little Rock	Arkansas	WSC	S	VI	14.3	35.5	8	56
Lorain-Elyria	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	40.0	104.7	20	50
*Los Angeles-Long Beach	California	P	W	IX	20.9	154.8	168	804

Table 8 (Continued)

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN 106 SMSA'S

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT VOLUNTEERING	HOURS PER VOLUNTEER	[N VOL]	[N]
Madison	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	18.4	262.8	7	38
Miami	Florida	SA	S	IV	8.0	136.0	14	176
*Milwaukee	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	22.1	85.8	40	181
*Minneapolis-St. Paul	Minnesota	WNC	NC	V	32.6	118.5	76	233
Mobile	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	45.8	55.3	11	24
Nashville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	17.2	64.4	11	64
*Nassau-Suffolk	New York	MA	E	II	17.3	98.0	43	249
New Haven	Connecticut	NE	E	I	23.7	186.2	9	38
New Orleans	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	13.5	195.8	13	96
*New York	New York	MA	E	II	12.2	176.1	113	923
*Newark	New Jersey	MA	E	II	20.3	124.0	44	217
Newport News-Hampton	Virginia	SA	S	III	18.2	51.7	6	33
Norfolk-Portsmouth	Virginia	SA	S	III	34.7	41.0	25	72
Oklahoma City	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	27.1	48.8	16	59
Orlando	Florida	SA	S	IV	23.1	119.7	12	52
Oxnard-Ventura	California	P	W	IX	23.7	226.0	9	38
*Patterson-Clifton-Passaic	New Jersey	MA	E	II	24.6	185.5	31	126
Peoria	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	34.8	159.8	16	46
*Philadelphia	Pennsylvania-New Jersey	MA	E	III	21.4	132.8	123	574

Table 8 (Continued)

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN 106 SMSA'S

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT VOLUNTEERING	HOURS PER VOLUNTEER	[N VOL]	[N]
Phoenix	Arizona	RM	W	IX	24.0	104.0	25	104
*Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	28.7	110.6	74	258
Reading	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	27.3	38.4	9	33
Richmond	Virginia	SA	S	III	33.9	146.5	20	59
Rochester	New York	MA	E	II	23.7	130.3	23	97
Rockford	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	29.2	79.6	14	48
Sacramento	California	P	W	IX	23.7	112.7	27	114
*St. Louis	Missouri-Illinois	WNC	NC	VII	35.0	145.6	96	274
Salinas-Monterey	California	P	W	IX	21.4	392.7	3	14
San Antonio	Texas	WSC	S	VI	16.1	106.4	14	87
*San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario	California	P	W	IX	24.8	155.7	37	149
*San Diego	California	P	W	IX	23.7	123.9	40	169
*San Francisco-Oakland	California	P	W	IX	26.1	162.6	83	318
*San Jose	California	P	W	IX	27.5	87.6	33	120
Santa Barbara	California	P	W	IX	41.7	88.0	15	36
*Seattle-Everett	Washington	P	W	X	40.1	113.7	65	162
Shreveport	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	13.0	20.3	6	46
South Bend	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	31.3	79.6	10	32

Table 8 (Continued)

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN 106 SMSA'S

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT VOLUNTEERING	HOURS PER VOLUNTEER	$[N_{VOL}]$	[N]
Spokane	Washington	P	W	X	21.6	163.2	8	37
Stockton	California	P	W	IX	14.6	197.0	6	41
Syracuse	New York	MA	E	II	27.3	78.8	15	55
Tacoma	Washington	P	W	X	40.4	220.9	19	47
Tampa-St. Petersburg	Florida	SA	S	IV	13.2	141.5	20	152
Trenton	New Jersey	MA	E	II	26.3	165.0	10	38
Tulsa	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	23.1	32.8	12	52
Utica-Rome	New York	MA	E	II	22.2	30.8	8	36
*Washington	D.C.-Maryland-Virginia	SA	S	III	25.5	151.3	77	302
West Palm Beach	Florida	SA	S	IV	24.4	78.0	11	45
Wichita	Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	21.9	280.0	7	32
Wilkes Barre-Hazelton	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	15.6	19.1	7	45
Worcester	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	20.8	69.6	10	48
York	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	31.8	133.7	7	22
Youngstown-Warren	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	20.3	145.2	16	79
All 106 SMSA's					22.8	118.6	2,907	12,768
All Other Areas					24.8	96.8	2,720	10,963
National					23.7	108.0	5,627	23,731

CENSUS DIVISIONS:
NE New England
MA Middle Atlantic
ENC East North Central
WNC West North Central
SA South Atlantic
ESC East South Central
WSC West South Central
RM (Rocky) Mountain
P Pacific

CENSUS REGIONS: E Northeast NC North Central S South W West ACTION REGIONS: I through X

*SMSA's on which we have been performing more detailed analysis throughout ($N \geq 30$) are marked with an asterisk throughout the Table.

Yet, if we compare New Orleans (195.8 hours and 96 respondents in all) or New York (176.1 average hours with 923 respondents in all) with Shreveport, Louisiana (20.3 hours and 46 respondents) or Johnstown, Pennsylvania (26.3 hours and 22 respondents) or with Norfolk-Portsmouth (41.0 hours and 72 respondents), the reality of the differences, if not their extreme magnitude, is simply reinforced.

Thus we have obviously considerable variability both in terms of volunteering rates and in terms of hours per volunteer. Basically, three major outcomes are possible:

a. SMSA's with high volunteering rates have also high hours per volunteer so that many people are spending many hours: a tendency of this type would imply also that SMSA's with low volunteering rates have also low volunteering time averages, and thus they would have few volunteers each spending but a few hours.

b. SMSA's with high volunteering rates have low volunteering hours per volunteer, while those with low rates yield high hours for each of the (relatively) fewer volunteers. This, on balance, could amount to a situation in which there is little, or no, SMSA variability in terms of overall effort (total numbers of hours spent, let us say) because high numbers of volunteers are counterbalanced by less effort and low numbers of volunteers are, in turn, counterbalanced by high levels of individual effort.

c. There could, of course, be a mixed result such that some high rate SMSA's have high hours per volunteer and others have low hours, whereas low rate SMSA's might also be split among those with high and low average hours. This would, of course, suggest that rates and hours are basically unrelated to each other across the roster of these 106 SMSA's.

The simplest test of these alternative outcomes involves the ranking of the SMSA's once relative to rates and once relative to hours, and calculating the appropriate correlation. A high positive coefficient would support possible outcome a. as specified previously. A high negative correlation would support the hypothesis on which outcome b. is predicated. Finally, an essentially zero correlation would be compatible with outcome c. above.

We find a Spearman rho coefficient of Rho = -.018, clearly not statistically different from zero correlation. Outcome c. finds strong support in the actual results. High rate SMSA's have evidently both high and low volunteering hours averages, and low rate SMSA's also have high and low times spent volunteering with the counterbalance represented by the zero value of the (rank) correlation.[14]

For the sake of clarity, and in anticipation of subsequent probes, Table 9 provides a tabulation of the SMSA's which most clearly reflect these counterveiling patterns.

Table 9

SMSA'S WITH HIGH VARIABILITY IN VOLUNTEERING RATES AND IN HOURS PER VOLUNTEER

	High Rates Rate	High Hours Hours		High Rates Rate	Low Hours Hours
Akron	31.1	151.9	Beaumont	35.7	32.0
Albany	34.7	188.4	Corpus Christi	41.7	55.8
Baton Rouge	38.9	143.7	Des Moines	41.7	42.0
El Paso	37.5	153.8	Johnstown	31.8	21.3
Peoria	34.8	159.8	Mobile	45.8	55.3
Richmond	33.9	146.5	Norfolk	34.7	41.0
St. Louis	35.0	145.6			
Tacoma	40.4	220.9			
York	31.8	133.7			
	Low Rates Rate	High Hours Hours		Low Rates Rate	Low Hours Hours
Greenville	13.5	134.8	Fresno	17.3	51.3
Hartford	10.8	150.8	Jackson	17.6	45.3
Jersey City	13.3	130.3	Little Rock	14.3	35.5
Miami	8.0	136.0	Wilkes Barre	15.6	19.1
New Orleans	13.5	195.8	Shreveport	13.0	20.3
New York	12.2	176.1	Nashville	17.2	64.4
Stockton	14.6	197.0			
Tampa	13.2	141.5			

Whether, and how, these major differences in rates and hours can be accounted for, both singly and jointly, is not at issue at this time. For the time being, our main focus has been merely to determine the extent to which variability in volunteering patterns does exist, and the data lend strong support to this conclusion.

IV. FREQUENCY OF VOLUNTEERING

A key schematization of the issues raised in this part of our analysis is about as follows:

1. A volunteer may be engaged in the respective activity frequently, if not regularly, and spend a great deal of time doing it.[15]
2. A volunteer may be frequently active on the particular project(s), but spend only a relatively little time.
3. A volunteer may become involved only infrequently, but spend a great deal of time when actually volunteering.
4. A volunteer may be only infrequently helping out, and also spend only relatively little time.

Nor is this taxonomization assumed to somehow reflect only the decisions on the part of volunteers, though, to some extent, this would clearly be the case.

1. Some needs for volunteers are such that regularity (or high frequency, at least) of volunteering along with some non-negligible time investment on each occasion may be necessary, or, minimally, preferrable.[16]
2. Some needs for volunteers are such that regularity is highly desirable, if not required, but the amount of time on each occasion may be relatively small.
3. Some needs for volunteers are only occasional, but a great deal of time is necessary on such occasions if the program is to succeed as best it can.
4. Some needs for volunteers may be only occasional, and requiring relatively little in the way of time for each volunteer.

At the local level, where needs for volunteers become manifest and where actual volunteerng occurs, problems would obviously result to the extent to which sharp discrepancies might exist between the "need" and the "availability" schematizations.

Consider the situation where the local needs are for volunteers who can help on a regular or frequent basis and whose effort is needed for several hours on each such occasion. In this case there might be difficulties of sorts even if there were many volunteers overall and if the volunteers in a given setting lean toward either occasional volunteering with high time investment. Problems could also arise when there are mainly regular volunteers who give relatively little time or when volunteers work only sporadically giving only a few hours time at that. We do not know the need structures for volunteers in the nation's SMSA's. If we did, we would be in a position to identify the need/availability problems most directly, along with plausible solutions which seem applicable to the particular circumstances.

However, we know that high variability in numbers of volunteers exists, as does variability in hours per volunteer. We can, therefore, ascertain at least how volunteering frequencies relate to both rates and hours, and thus come to a better understanding of the pattern that prevails relative to the previously outlined needs/availabilities schematization.

Given such results, we will be in a position to conclude whether particular types of needs for volunteers can be better met in some, rather than in other, SMSA's--whether or not such needs exist or are nascent. Table 10 provides the basic result for the 30 SMSA's in which we had data on at least 30 volunteers.

The variability in the data is pronounced and, we think, important. In the Patterson-Clifton-Passaic SMSA ("Passaic" in Table 10), the data imply 54.6 volunteering events per volunteering during the year. In Buffalo, New York, the comparable statistic is 25.4. To be sure: in the Passaic area, the volunteers averaged one activity per week, while in Buffalo, they averaged about one activity every two weeks.

The national standard, which we derive here, involves some kind of volunteering about every 1.5 weeks (34.9 times during the year per volunteer).

From Table 8 we know how much time, on balance, the volunteers spent during the year. We may now ask: on the average, how many hours did the volunteers work on each occasion on which they did, in fact, engage in voluntary activity? Table 11 results.

Table 10

VOLUNTEERING FREQUENCY IN SMSA'S WITH AT LEAST 30 VOLUNTEERS DURING 1973-1974

	N	Only Once	A Few Times	Once a Month	About Every Two Weeks	Once a Week	Other	Times Per Year*
Anaheim	(62)	11.3	32.3	11.3	4.8	33.9	6.4	28.3
Atlanta	(49)	14.3	24.5	8.2	12.2	26.5	14.3	33.9
Baltimore	(52)	15.4	19.2	9.6	11.5	34.6	9.6	33.1
Boston	(49)	0.0	22.4	12.2	8.2	40.8	16.4	42.7
Buffalo	(43)	11.6	30.2	14.0	16.3	20.9	7.0	25.4
Chicago	(145)	4.1	16.6	11.7	13.1	42.8	11.7	39.9
Cleveland	(34)	2.9	32.4	8.8	5.9	35.3	14.7	37.6
Columbus	(30)	13.3	20.0	13.3	13.3	36.7	3.3	28.5
Dallas	(51)	3.9	15.7	5.9	7.8	60.8	5.9	41.1
Denver	(49)	6.1	24.5	18.4	6.1	26.5	18.4	37.1
Detroit	(102)	8.8	31.4	14.7	7.8	29.4	7.8	28.6
Houston	(37)	2.7	21.6	16.2	8.1	35.1	16.2	40.1
Indianapolis	(53)	7.5	22.6	11.3	13.1	18.9	26.4	43.0
Kansas City	(42)	2.4	31.0	9.5	14.3	40.5	2.4	29.6
Los Angeles	(168)	6.5	13.7	11.3	10.1	42.9	15.5	43.0
Milwaukee	(40)	7.5	17.5	17.5	20.0	30.0	7.5	31.5
Minneapolis	(76)	6.6	28.9	9.2	9.2	31.6	14.5	36.2
Nassau	(43)	7.0	18.6	16.3	11.6	32.6	14.0	37.2
New York	(113)	6.2	10.6	7.1	15.0	38.9	22.1	48.5
Newark	(44)	18.2	13.6	11.4	6.8	45.5	4.5	32.2

Table 10 (Continuted)

VOLUNTEERING FREQUENCY IN SMSA'S WITH AT LEAST 30 VOLUNTEERS DURING 1973-1974

	(N)	Only Once	A Few Times	Once a Month	About Every Two Weeks	Once a Week	Other	Times Per Year*
Passaic	(31)	0.0	6.4	19.4	12.9	29.0	32.2	54.6
Philadelphia	(123)	8.1	22.0	11.4	8.1	39.8	10.6	36.1
Pittsburgh	(74)	10.8	14.9	12.2	8.1	39.2	14.9	40.1
St. Louis	(96)	4.2	21.9	18.8	10.4	29.2	15.6	37.3
San Bernardino	(37)	8.1	5.4	24.3	8.1	40.5	13.5	40.4
San Diego	(40)	7.5	17.5	22.5	10.0	27.5	15.0	36.0
San Francisco	(83)	7.2	21.7	8.4	8.4	33.7	20.5	43.0
San Jose	(33)	6.1	24.2	15.2	15.2	33.3	6.1	30.4
Seattle	(65)	7.7	27.7	13.8	6.2	32.3	12.3	34.0
Washington, D.C.	(77)	6.5	16.9	13.0	5.2	52.9	15.6	42.1
All SMSA's	(2907)	7.7	20.9	13.2	10.0	35.8	12.3	36.5
All others	(2720)	7.5	23.1	15.1	10.3	35.0	9.0	33.1
National	(5627)	7.6	21.9	14.1	10.2	35.4	10.7	34.9

*The average "times per year" is calculated by assuming that "other" response represents volunteering, on balance, about twice each week (104 times in the year). For the category "a few times," we have assumed volunteering about "once in a quarter," that is, four times each year.

Table 11

AVERAGE HOURS OF VOLUNTEERING FOR EACH TIME OF VOLUNTEERING FOR SMSA'S WITH 30 OR MORE VOLUNTEERS DURING THE YEAR

	Average Hours*		Average Hours*
St. Louis	3.9	San Jose Anaheim	2.9
San Francisco Dallas San Bernardino Newark	3.8	Cleveland Pittsburgh	2.8
Philadelphia Baltimore	3.7	Boston Milwaukee	2.7
New York Los Angeles Washington, D.C.	3.6	Chicago Nassau-Suffolk	2.6
		Columbus	2.5
Buffalo	3.5	Houston	2.3
Passaic San Diego	3.4	Indianapolis	2.2
Minneapolis Seattle	3.3	Denver	2.1
		All SMSA'S	3.2
Atlanta Detroit Kansas City	3.2	Other Areas	2.9
		National	3.1

*This results by dividing the average hours per volunteer (Table 8) by average number of times volunteering occurred during the year, (Table 10).

On the average, therefore, each time (37.3 times per year) a St. Louis SMSA volunteer went out to help, about 3.9 hours were spent on the activity; while 2.2 hours were spent by Indianapolis SMSA volunteers on each of their 43 volunteering occasions.

What can be said about the overall relationship between volunteering rates, hours and times-per-year during which the volunteers engaged in their project(s)? To answer this question, the 30 SMSA's (of Table 10) were rank-ordered on the three variables. A summary of the result is given in Table 12.

Table 12

VOLUNTEERING FREQUENCY AND RATES AND HOURS RANK-ORDER CORRELATIONS
(30 SMSA's)

Volunteering frequency with	Rank Order Correlation
Volunteering rates*	-.172
Volunteering hours*	+.658

*As per Table 8 for these 30 SMSA's (Table 10).

Previously, we had determined that there is essentially no relationship between volunteering rates and average hours. If anything, the coefficient was slightly negative, suggesting a tendency toward a situation in which the more volunteers there are, the fewer hours they spend each in their voluntary activity.

Table 12 shows that there is some, though insignificant, negative relation between rates and frequencies: the more people volunteer, the less often they tend to do so during the year. But the relation between volunteering hours and frequencies is high and positive. It is, of course, also significantly different from a zero correlation: the more often people volunteer, the more hours they also tend to spend each time they volunteer, or at least, on the overall basis.

Let us now define those who volunteered only once, a few times, or at most once a month as "occasional" volunteers, and all others, as "regular" volunteers. Table 13 shows, of course, that average volunteering hours are consistently much higher for regular, than for occasional, volunteers. This, in Newark SMSA, is so by almost a factor of 10 even though regular volunteers exceed the less regular ones only by a factor of 1.4. In Washington, D.C. with 1.75 times as many regular as occasional volunteers, the regulars yield hour averages 2.6 times higher than do the less frequent volunteering participants.

But once we consider the data in terms of hours spent on each estimated volunteering occasion, the less regular volunteers spend more time per event than do the regulars.

Table 13

AVERAGE HOURS, AVERAGE VOLUNTEERING OCCASIONS, AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEERING OCCASION ON THE PART OF REGULAR AND OCCASIONAL VOLUNTEERS

	Occasional Volunteers				Regular Volunteers			
	(N)	Average Hours	Number of Occasions	Hours per Occasion	(N)	Average Hours	Number of Occasions	Hours per Occasion
Anaheim	(34)	39.2	5.0	7.8	(28)	135.8	56.6	2.4
Atlanta	(23)	25.0	4.5	5.6	(26)	182.2	60.0	3.0
Baltimore	(23)	31.0	4.7	6.6	(29)	196.4	55.6	3.5
Boston	(17)	38.5	6.8	5.7	(32)	158.3	61.8	2.6
Buffalo	(24)	32.3	5.4	6.0	(19)	160.7	50.6	3.2
Chicago	(47)	25.6	6.5	3.9	(97)	141.9	55.5	2.6
Cleveland	(15)	28.7	5.4	5.3	(19)	167.1	62.9	2.6
Columbus	(14)	29.0	5.4	5.4	(16)	109.9	48.8	2.2
Dallas	(13)	31.2	5.4	5.8	(38)	200.7	53.4	3.8
Denver	(24)	18.3	6.6	2.8	(25)	133.8	67.6	2.0
Detroit	(56)	30.3	5.7	5.3	(45)	166.4	55.5	3.0
Houston	(15)	28.7	7.0	4.1	(22)	135.1	62.6	2.2
Indianapolis	(22)	21.1	5.6	3.8	(31)	145.4	69.6	2.1
Kansas City	(18)	20.3	5.6	3.6	(24)	151.8	47.7	3.2
Los Angeles	(53)	35.1	6.2	5.7	(114)	211.8	50.4	4.2
Milwaukee	(17)	29.6	6.8	4.4	(23)	127.2	49.7	2.6
Minneapolis	(34)	33.7	5.2	6.5	(42)	187.1	61.3	3.0
Nassau	(18)	23.1	6.6	3.5	(25)	151.9	59.3	2.6
New York	(27)	45.9	5.6	8.2	(86)	217.0	62.0	3.5

Table 13 (Continued)

AVERAGE HOURS, AVERAGE VOLUNTEERING OCCASIONS, AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEERING OCCASION ON THE PART OF REGULAR AND OCCASIONAL VOLUNTEERS

	Occasional Volunteers				Regular Volunteers			
	(N)	Average Hours	Number of Occasions	Hours per Occasion	(N)	Average Hours	Number of Occasions	Hours per Occasion
Newark	(19)	22.5	4.8	4.7	(25)	201.1	53.0	3.8
Passaic	(8)	60.5	10.0	6.1	(23)	229.0	70.1	3.3
Philadelphia	(51)	35.8	5.6	6.4	(71)	201.5	57.1	3.5
Pittsburgh	(28)	41.1	5.7	7.2	(46)	152.9	61.0	2.5
St. Louis	(43)	58.5	7.1	8.2	(52)	220.3	61.0	3.6
San Bernardino	(14)	50.4	8.5	6.6	(23)	219.7	59.9	3.7
San Francisco	(31)	50.2	5.2	9.6	(52)	229.7	65.5	3.5
San Diego	(19)	56.5	7.3	7.7	(21)	184.9	61.9	3.0
San Jose	(15)	25.3	6.3	4.0	(18)	139.4	50.6	2.8
Seattle	(32)	36.3	5.8	6.2	(33)	188.7	61.4	3.1
Washington, D.C.	(28)	73.8	6.3	11.7	(49)	195.6	62.6	3.1

Occasional volunteers: those who volunteered once, a few times, once a month.
Regular volunteers: those who volunteered every week or more often and every two weeks.

Average hours of volunteering applies to the year ending April, 1974.

Average occasions refers to numbers of times of volunteering over the year, if "weekly" volunteering implies a frequency of 52, every two weeks, 26, every month, 12, a few times, 4, once, 1, and "other" is assumed to be about twice a week (and thus equals 104).

Average hours per occasion: volunteering hours estimate of time spent each time volunteering occurred (on each "occasion," as above).

In Anaheim, Buffalo and Detroit SMSA's there are more reported occasional than regular volunteers, given our operational definition of these two categories. In Anaheim, they spend 3.2 times as much time on each volunteering occasion than do the regular volunteers: but they get involved only about once for every 11 volunteering events of the more regular participants. In Buffalo, the occasional volunteers (a majority of 55.8 percent of all) invest almost twice as many (1.9 times) hours, when they do volunteer, as the regulars. They volunteer once for about every nine volunteering events of the more frequent participants. In Detroit, the occasional volunteers (55.4 percent of all) exceed the regular ones by a factor of about 1.8 when they volunteer but the more frequent volunteers become involved ten times as often.

In Seattle and Denver, there are just about as many "occasional" as there are "regular" volunteers. In each instance, the regular volunteers report just about ten times as many volunteering occasions as do the regular volunteers. But those who are less frequently involved in Seattle spend twice the time of the regulars when they do volunteer, while in Denver, 1.4 times the time of the more frequent participants.

A succinct summary of the result presented in Table 13 is, perhaps, as follows:

*the less frequent volunteers (whose percentage among all volunteers fluctuates from about 55 percent to about 25 percent) can be expected to work between four and ten times during the year and spend just about four to 12 hours on each such occasion.

*The more frequent volunteers can be expected to participate about 50 to 70 times per year, and spend about two to four hours each time.

Only a careful analysis of the frequency-and-time distribution of needs, for which data are not available at this time, would permit a closer mapping of the particular patterns of each SMSA relative to the basic operational questions which coordinators of volunteering activities may face.

V. VOLUNTEERS IN RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

About 18 percent of all volunteers reported having done only religious volunteering, at least, thus far. Of course, such people are most likely mobilizable for non-religious activities, when needed, much easier than might be those who have done no volunteering at all.

At the same time, the commitment to religious volunteering may often be quite intensive, and it is not at all obvious that religious volunteers would have time or energy to undertake activities beyond those in which they have been already involved.

Table 14 reveals again the variability in percentages of those Americans who had reported prior religious volunteering only. From the high percentages in the Patterson-Clifton-Passaic (25.8 percent) and Dallas SMSA's (25.5 percent), the results range to the lows in Cleveland (3 percent) or Nassau-Suffolk area (4.7 percent). If we correlate the percentages of only religious volunteers with the overall rates, volunteering hours, and frequencies per year (as reported in Table 10, last column), we find a small, insignificant, negative correlation between religious volunteering and overall rates; and higher, somewhat significant correlation, between average hours and yearly frequencies and religious volunteering rates.

The positive correlations between percentages of those individuals who had done only religious volunteering and average annual hours for all volunteers, and the average frequency of volunteering occasions per annum, might suggest that the religious volunteers may account for the SMSA variability in terms of time investment and volunteering occasions patterns.

Table 16 shows that this is not the case. In fact, in 20 of these 30 SMSA's it is the non-religious-only volunteers whose hourly averages exceed those of the volunteers confined to religious work; and in 16 of the SMSA's, the annual occasions for volunteering are greater for those who are other than "religious-only" volunteers.

Table 14

PERCENTAGES OF THOSE WHO DID VOLUNTEER FOR RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES ONLY*

	Percent	[N]**
Anaheim	8.1	[62]
Atlanta	12.2	[49]
Baltimore	17.3	[52]
Boston	8.2	[49]
Buffalo	9.3	[43]
Chicago	13.8	[145]
Cleveland	3.0	[34]
Columbus	13.3	[30]
Dallas	25.5	[51]
Denver	14.3	[49]
Detroit	16.7	[102]
Houston	13.5	[37]
Indianapolis	13.2	[53]
Kansas City	16.7	[102]
Los Angeles	12.0	[168]
Milwaukee	10.0	[40]
Minneapolis	14.5	[76]
Nassau	4.7	[43]
New York	18.6	[113]
Newark	13.6	[44]
Passaic	25.8	[31]
Philadelphia	16.3	[123]
Pittsburgh	20.3	[74]
St. Louis	6.2	[96]
San Bernardino	16.2	[37]
San Diego	22.5	[40]
San Francisco	13.3	[83]
San Jose	6.1	[33]
Seattle	9.2	[65]
Washington, D.C.	9.1	[77]

*"N" is the total number of volunteers in each SMSA on which the percentage of "religious-only" volunteers is based.

**In SMSA's where 30 or more of the respondents had volunteered in prior year.

Table 15

RANK CORRELATIONS FOR 30 SMSA's BETWEEN RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING RATE, OVERALL RATE, AVERAGE HOURS AND AVERAGE ANNUAL FREQUENCIES

Percentage of Religious Volunteers with	Rank-order Correlation
Overall volunteering rate	-.029
Average hours per volunteer	+.350
Average number of volunteering events during the year	+.220

The extent to which religious volunteers invest their time varies greatly among these SMSA's: some 20 hours per year in Seattle, and over 242 hours in Boston.

Actually, only 12 hours on the average were reported by religious volunteers in Cleveland; some 229 hours in San Francisco.

Nor is it simply that the more religious volunteers there are, the more time each tends to spend as if the activity had somehow reinforcements built into it just by noting, or knowing, that many others are involved.

The correlation between percentages of religious volunteers and the average hours invested in volunteering on the part of these volunteers is positive, rho = .200, but rather low.

There is also a great deal of variation in the frequency of volunteering occasions per annum. The religious volunteers in Seattle SMSA reported an average of 4.3 volunteering events during the year (and an average of 20.3 hours for the year, or about 4.7 hours per occasion), while their peers in the New York City SMSA, having spent about 170 hours each during the year (and 3 hours for each volunteering event) averaged 57 occasions on which they had been involved in religious voluntary work. But numbers of volunteers in the SMSA's do not correlate significantly with annual frequencies, rho = .235, though the coefficient is positive and not altogether negligible.

There is, thus, a tendency, but not more than that, for a greater volunteering frequency when there are more volunteers, and also for greater average time investment.

Table 16

VOLUNTEERING HOURS, YEARLY OCCASIONS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER OCCASION FOR RELIGIOUS-ONLY VOLUNTEERS AND FOR OTHER VOLUNTEERS*

	Volunteering Hours		Annual Volunteering Occasions		Hours per Occasion	
	Religious	Others	Religious	Others	Religious	Others
Annaheim	22.0	89.7	33.8	27.8	0.6	3.2
Atlanta	128.0	105.7	47.8	32.0	2.7	3.3
Baltimore	120.0	124.0	22.4	35.3	5.4	3.5
Boston	242.5	105.5	53.0	41.8	4.6	2.0
Buffalo	208.0	76.9	39.2	24.0	5.3	3.2
Chicago	90.9	105.3	36.0	40.5	2.5	2.6
Cleveland	12.0	108.8	12.0	38.4	1.0	2.8
Columbus	59.0	74.1	22.8	29.4	2.6	2.5
Dallas	215.1	137.8	54.3	36.6	4.0	3.8
Denver	19.1	86.9	26.8	38.8	0.7	2.2
Detroit	156.2	77.5	34.4	27.5	4.5	2.8
Houston	52.0	98.1	36.8	40.6	1.4	2.4
Indianapolis	53.1	100.0	40.6	43.4	1.3	2.3
Kansas City	26.3	109.2	24.0	30.7	1.1	3.6
Los Angeles	167.8	153.0	48.2	42.3	3.5	3.6
Milwaukee	220.5	70.8	35.5	31.0	6.2	2.3
Minneapolis	51.8	129.8	26.4	37.8	2.0	3.4
Nassau	62.0	99.8	52.0	36.5	1.2	2.7
New York	170.2	177.4	57.0	46.6	3.0	3.8
Newark	76.7	131.5	44.0	30.3	1.7	4.3

Table 16 (continued)

VOLUNTEERING HOURS, YEARLY OCCASIONS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER OCCASION FOR RELIGIOUS-ONLY VOLUNTEERS AND FOR OTHER VOLUNTEERS*

	Volunteering Hours		Annual Volunteering Occasions		Hours per Occasion	
	Religious	Others	Religious	Others	Religious	Others
Passaic	96.5	216.4	42.0	59.0	2.3	3.7
Philadelphia	115.7	136.1	41.9	35.0	2.8	3.9
Pittsburgh	78.8	118.7	31.9	42.2	2.5	2.8
St. Louis	111.3	147.9	37.5	37.3	3.0	4.0
San Bernardino	154.0	156.0	34.3	41.6	4.5	3.8
San Diego	172.9	109.7	52.9	31.1	3.3	3.5
San Francisco	229.3	152.4	32.2	44.6	7.1	3.4
San Jose	131.0	84.8	19.0	31.1	6.9	2.7
Seattle	20.3	123.2	4.3	37.0	4.7	3.3
Washington, D.C.	46.0	161.8	19.6	44.4	2.3	3.6
All SMSA's	113.9	119.4	37.2	36.4	3.1	3.3
All other areas	76.9	102.0	32.9	33.2	2.3	3.1
National	92.4	111.3	34.7	34.9	2.7	3.2

* "Other" volunteers are all respondents who did not report having done religious volunteering only. Thus many, in this category, may also have done religious voluntary work in addition to whatever other activities.

The volunteering frequency and average hours annually for the religious volunteers yield a relatively high, and significant, correlation, rho = .573. This, of course, implies that on each volunteering occasion a relatively limited amount of time is spent, and the more occasions to volunteer there are, the greater the overall time contribution. In turn, this implies that if frequencies of volunteering events were increased, or if they simply did increase, the respective volunteers would not spend less time on each of the more frequent occasions, and the overall contribution would be actually enhanced to an extent by mobilizing more frequent, or more regular, effort.

VI. TIME OF FIRST VOLUNTEERING

The national results (Table 3) show that almost half of all volunteers became first involved in non-religious voluntary activities in the 1970's (46 percent).

Some 28 percent reported their initial volunteering in the 1960's, and 25 percent prior to that.

In several of the SMSA's for which we have fair numbers of volunteers to begin with, the most recent entrants exceed 50 percent:

Passaic
Nassau
Chicago
San Francisco
New York
San Diego
San Jose
Indianapolis
Denver
Detroit
Pittsburgh
Dallas

This contrasts sharply with several other SMSA's in which less than one third of the volunteers are of the most recent vintage:

Atlanta
Anaheim
Washington, D.C.
San Bernardino
Milwaukee

In some of the SMSA's the plurality of the volunteers began their involvement in the 1960's:

Anaheim
Atlanta
Houstom
Milwaukee

Finally, in three areas of the nation, the largest group of volunteers has a tradition of participation that goes back into 1950's and before:

Buffalo
San Bernardino
Washington, D.C.

The composition of the volunteer force, in terms of the length of time which elapsed between their initial non-religious volunteering and the time of the 1974 research, therefore quite variable. Old-timers dominate in a few instances; relative newcomers to volunteerism are the strongest component of the group in other SMSA's.

To what extent, if any at all, are there differences in volunteering hours or annual frequencies given the variability in the length of service? Table 18 provides the basic data.

On one hand, we might expect that oldtimers might do more volunteering than others. The explanatory argument might run somewhat as follows: people who had become volunteers long ago and are still continuing their activities (without assuming that they have been doing the same kind of volunteering or in the same organizational context over the years) must have found enjoyment, or other types of important rewards (such as a feeling that they are truly helping others), in their work in order to persist. Thus their past, in some manner, becomes a reinforcer and tends to induce high levels of involvement in the present (1973-1974).

On the other hand, we might suspect that newcomers to volunteering could exceed the oldtimers simply because most new participants in any activity become joiners out of commitment and out of enthusiasm, and their pattern of participation does not get routinized

Table 17

TIME OF FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTARY ACTIVITY

	[N]*	Before 1950	1950-1959	1960-1964	1965-1969	1970-1974
Anaheim	[57]	16.0	19.2	17.5	22.8	24.6
Atlanta	[43]	27.0	11.6	32.6	27.9	20.9
Baltimore	[43]	9.3	7.0	11.6	23.3	48.8
Boston	[45]	11.1	13.3	11.1	26.7	37.8
Buffalo	[39]	23.1	17.9	5.1	15.4	35.9
Chicago	[125]	4.8	12.8	11.2	12.8	56.8
Cleveland	[33]	6.1	27.3	18.2	6.1	42.4
Columbus	[26]	19.2	11.5	15.4	15.4	38.5
Dallas	[38]	15.8	10.5	10.5	13.2	50.0
Denver	[42]	9.5	14.3	14.3	4.8	57.1
Detroit	[85]	9.4	12.9	11.8	10.6	51.8
Houston	[32]	9.4	3.1	12.5	34.4	37.5
Indianapolis	[46]	4.3	17.4	8.7	17.4	52.2
Kansas City	[42]	2.9	25.7	20.0	5.7	45.7
Los Angeles	[148]	17.6	10.8	8.8	14.2	47.3
Milwaukee	[36]	8.3	22.2	13.9	25.0	30.6
Minneapolis	[76]	23.1	16.9	10.8	9.2	40.0
Nassau	[41]	9.8	4.9	7.3	14.6	63.4
New York	[92]	12.0	12.0	12.0	7.6	56.5
Newark	[38]	13.2	15.8	10.5	18.4	42.1

Table 17 (continued)

	[N]*	Before 1950	1950-1959	1960-1964	1965-1969	1970-1974
Passaic	[23]	0.0	0.0	8.7	13.0	78.3
Philadelphia	[103]	14.6	12.6	11.7	18.4	42.7
Pittsburgh	[59]	11.9	8.5	8.5	13.6	50.8
St. Louis	[90]	11.1	14.4	16.7	14.4	38.9
San Bernardino	[31]	19.4	22.6	9.7	29.0	19.4
San Diego	[31]	12.9	9.7	12.5	9.7	54.8
San Francisco	[72]	9.7	9.7	9.7	12.5	58.3
San Jose	[31]	9.7	9.7	9.7	19.4	51.6
Seattle	[59]	15.3	16.9	11.9	8.5	47.5
Washington, D.C.	[70]	17.1	20.0	11.4	21.4	27.1
All SMSA's	[2,495]	12.1	13.5	12.1	15.6	45.4
Other areas	[2,151]	12.5	11.8	11.4	16.1	46.4
National	[4,646]	12.3	12.7	11.8	15.8	45.9

*Includes all volunteers except those who had done only religious voluntary work and who were not, by the Bureau of the Census, asked the question about their earliest involvement.

Table 18

VOLUNTEERING HOURS, ANNUAL FREQUENCIES AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEERING OCCASION DEPENDENT ON TIME OF INITIAL NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING

	Average hours			Annual Frequencies			Hours per Volunteering Event		
	Before 1960	1960-1969	1970-1974	Before 1960	1960-1969	1970-1974	Before 1960	1960-1969	1970-1974
Annaheim	112.9	82.0	70.1	23.3	34.0	38.1	4.8	2.1	1.8
Atlanta	54.2	135.7	64.9	26.1	34.3	30.4	2.1	4.0	2.1
Baltimore	106.8	217.7	62.7	32.1	40.7	32.5	3.3	5.3	1.9
Boston	82.5	114.8	111.2	17.6	48.0	51.2	4.7	2.4	2.2
Buffalo	77.8	88.8	73.7	23.1	20.8	28.2	3.4	4.3	2.6
Chicago	158.4	151.6	71.9	43.0	40.0	40.3	3.7	3.8	1.8
Cleveland	197.8	95.0	46.8	57.4	31.9	27.0	3.4	3.0	1.7
Columbus	41.8	54.2	116.0	13.0	22.1	48.4	3.2	2.4	2.4
Dallas	211.4	142.2	97.0	39.1	35.7	35.8	5.4	4.0	2.7
Denver	42.0	116.2	95.8	27.9	32.2	46.8	1.5	3.6	2.0
Detroit	113.3	122.8	47.0	29.0	30.2	25.6	3.9	4.1	1.8
Houston	68.5	148.3	52.7	43.0	31.9	54.0	1.6	4.6	0.9
Indianapolis	161.8	128.5	60.0	62.8	37.7	38.2	2.6	3.4	1.6
Kansas City	150.0	110.2	83.2	27.4	28.3	34.2	5.5	3.9	2.4
Los Angeles	193.0	175.4	121.0	49.5	46.6	35.1	3.9	3.8	3.4
Milwaukee	98.5	77.3	34.7	32.0	35.8	23.9	3.1	2.2	1.4
Minneapolis	156.7	116.6	109.4	35.0	40.5	39.3	4.5	2.9	2.8
Nassau	131.1	183.1	96.2	24.4	36.0	30.8	5.4	5.1	3.1
New York	179.3	150.2	186.2	36.8	47.1	50.5	4.9	3.2	3.7
Newark	131.1	183.1	96.2	24.4	36.0	30.6	5.4	5.1	3.1

Table 18 (continued)

	Average Hours			Annual Frequencies			Hours per Volunteering Event		
	Before 1960	1960-1969	1970-1974	Before 1960	1960-1969	1970-1974	Before 1960	1960-1969	1970-1974
Passaic	---	206.4	219.3	---	59.6	58.8	---	3.5	3.7
Philadelphia	178.8	112.9	125.3	35.2	45.0	26.3	5.1	2.5	4.8
Pittsburgh	172.3	85.2	106.0	37.3	42.5	44.1	4.6	2.0	2.4
St. Louis	160.8	167.2	139.5	35.1	34.6	39.8	4.6	4.8	3.5
San Bernardino	240.2	97.2	91.3	51.8	32.0	38.8	4.6	3.0	2.4
San Diego	189.4	87.1	86.1	32.1	25.4	32.9	5.9	3.4	2.9
San Francisco	180.0	122.2	151.0	31.1	35.6	52.6	5.8	3.7	2.9
San Jose	53.7	144.4	62.9	47.7	25.6	28.1	1.1	5.6	2.2
Seattle	163.5	71.5	117.9	41.3	23.8	39.9	4.0	3.0	3.0
Washington, D.C.	190.9	167.4	118.5	46.4	45.3	39.7	4.1	3.7	3.0
All SMSA's	144.8	128.0	101.5	35.0	37.6	36.3	4.1	3.4	2.8
Other areas	142.5	109.2	77.9	37.0	34.9	29.5	3.8	3.1	2.6
National	143.8	119.3	90.5	35.9	36.3	33.1	4.0	3.3	2.7

for some time so that the enthusiasm involved in becoming a participant, in this instance, a volunteer, induces high levels of activity.

We find that the former hypothesis is strongly supported by the data: oldtimers consistently exceed the newcomers in volunteering hours; and while this does not quite apply to numbers of volunteering events over the year, the average time on each volunteering occasion tends to be consistently higher the longer the respondents have been volunteers. That the result has also important age implications is self-evident. But this aspect of the problem will not be considered in this report.

Although the overall pattern is rather clear, there are, of course, important exceptions. In Atlanta, where less than one third of the volunteers are in the most recent, 1970-1974, entry group, the newcomers spent more hours than did the oldtimers - but most hours were spent by volunteers of the 1960's (a majority of Atlanta volunteer force). In the Columbus SMSA, the newcomers exceed the oldtimers in volunteering hours by a factor of 2.8. In Denver, almost twice as many hours are invested by those who began their volunteering most recently than by the older participants; and the relative Denver newcomers amount to over 57 percent of all the volunteers.

In fact, an overall pattern in the data is revealed: by and large, the largest cohort (in terms of the approximate time of the first non-religious voluntary activity) in each SMSA also tends to claim the highest time investment in 1973-1974.

VII. REASONS FOR INITIAL NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING

To indicate the main rationale for first volunteering involvement, the respondents were provided with a list of several major alternatives:

*They had volunteered, to begin with, "to help people"
*"out of a sense of duty"
*"because they couldn't refuse when asked"
*"because they had a child in the program"
*"because they had nothing else to do"
*"because they enjoyed the activity"
*because they hoped to end up "with a paying job," and
*"other" reasons.

Table 19, based again on the 30 SMSA's for which the numbers of volunteers make an estimation worthwhile, shows that altruistic reasons ("to help people") along with a sense of satisfaction derived from volunteering ("enjoyment") are generally most important. Having a "child in the program" has also been frequently referred to, as was, to an extent, the feeling of "duty." But within each of these key reason categories, there are major differences among the SMSA's. Thus only 33.3 percent of the volunteers in Buffalo had reported their desire "to help people" as an important reason, while this percentage was 67.8 in St. Louis, 62.8 in Washington, D.C., 61.5 in Columbus, Ohio, and 61.0 in Pittsburgh.

Those who "enjoyed" their volunteering vary between 22.6 percent (as in San Jose) or 24.2 percent (as in Cleveland) to 52.2 percent in Passaic and 48.9 percent in St. Louis.

The "duty" factor is quite low in Anaheim (14.0 percent), Dallas (21.0 percent) and Atlanta (18.6 percent), but a much more crucial determinant of initial volunteering in such SMSA's as Houston (43.8 percent), San Bernardino (48.4 percent) or Denver (42.8 percent).

Having a child in the program for which the first non-religious volunteering occurred is clearly more relevant in some, than in other,

Table 19

REASONS FOR FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING ACTIVITY*

	To help people	Sense of duty	Couldn't refuse	Child in program	Nothing else to do	Enjoyment	Hope for job	Other
Anaheim	54.4	14.0	7.0	28.1	5.3	29.8	1.8	5.3
Atlanta	48.8	18.6	7.0	23.2	11.6	37.2	0.0	14.0
Baltimore	41.9	30.2	25.6	34.9	4.6	32.6	2.3	7.0
Boston	53.3	37.8	17.8	15.6	8.9	24.4	4.4	8.9
Buffalo	33.3	30.8	17.9	20.5	2.6	25.6	0.0	10.2
Chicago	54.4	37.6	13.6	30.4	1.6	31.2	4.0	8.8
Cleveland	45.4	30.3	6.1	18.2	6.1	24.2	0.0	9.1
Columbus	61.5	23.1	7.7	26.9	7.7	30.8	3.8	11.5
Dallas	47.4	21.0	7.9	28.9	2.6	28.9	2.6	7.9
Denver	45.2	42.8	16.7	31.0	2.4	35.7	2.4	11.9
Detroit	47.0	25.9	14.1	23.5	8.2	29.4	4.7	9.4
Houston	40.6	43.8	18.8	28.1	0.0	31.2	3.1	12.5
Indianapolis	54.3	21.7	17.4	10.9	2.2	47.8	0.0	4.3
Kansas City	33.3	33.3	9.5	21.4	2.4	31.0	0.0	3.4
Los Angeles	54.7	29.0	13.5	25.7	2.0	32.4	6.1	12.8
Milwaukee	50.0	41.9	22.2	30.6	2.8	41.7	0.0	5.6
Minneapolis	43.4	22.4	17.1	23.7	6.6	30.3	1.3	11.8
Nassau	46.3	26.8	12.2	36.6	2.4	41.5	0.0	7.3
New York	50.0	30.4	10.9	14.1	2.2	35.9	2.2	7.6
Newark	44.7	28.9	13.2	26.3	7.9	44.7	5.3	2.6
Passaic	34.8	34.8	17.4	13.0	4.3	52.2	0.0	4.3

Table 19

REASONS FOR FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING ACTIVITY*

	To help people	Sense of duty	Couldn't refuse	Child in program	Nothing else to do	Enjoyment	Hope for job	Other
Philadelphia	59.2	31.1	11.6	17.5	3.9	37.9	0.0	8.7
Pittsburgh	51.0	30.5	8.5	16.9	1.7	33.9	3.4	5.6
St. Louis	67.8	41.1	18.9	30.0	5.6	48.9	3.3	5.6
Ontario	54.8	48.4	6.4	12.9	0.0	22.6	3.2	6.4
San Diego	45.2	12.8	9.7	29.0	6.4	22.6	3.2	6.4
San Francisco	52.8	26.4	11.1	29.2	6.9	40.3	8.3	9.7
San Jose	48.4	32.2	25.8	22.5	0.0	22.6	0.0	22.6
Seattle	39.0	40.7	15.2	28.8	8.5	33.9	5.1	10.2
Washington, D.C.	62.8	40.0	11.4	22.8	4.3	40.0	4.3	7.1
SMSA's	52.5	31.3	14.0	23.9	3.6	34.7	3.0	8.7
Other areas	53.9	33.0	15.5	20.8	4.0	37.9	2.2	5.2
National	53.3	32.1	14.7	22.5	3.8	36.2	2.6	7.1

*Data based only on respondents who did voluntary work other than religious only. Since more answers than one were admissible, the percentages, across each row, generally exceed 100. The average number of reasons which were given in each SMSA would be obtainable by summing the percentages for a particular SMSA and dividing the result by 100. In the nation as a whole, 1.72 reasons were marked by the respondents on the average.

SMSA's: in Baltimore, 34.9 percent mentioned this reason, as did 36.6 percent of the respondents in Nassau-Suffolk, 31.0 percent in Denver, 30.6 percent in Milwaukee. In Patterson-Clifton-Passaic, the percentage was only 13.0 percent; in San Bernardino, 12.9 percent; in New York, 14.1 percent. It was, to be sure, only 10.9 percent in Indianapolis where altruistic and enjoyment motivation was claimed to have been particularly strong.

If we consider the distributions of responses within each SMSA, there are some exceptions to the basic ranking ("to help people," "enjoyment," "sense of duty" and "child in program") of the factors most often cited.

In the Patterson-Clifton-Passaic (Passaic in the Table) area, the sense of enjoyment was much more important than any other rationale, and having a child in the program was relatively unimportant. In Newark, just about as many respondents referred to their desire to "help people" as did to enjoyability of the volunteering activity. In Indianapolis, the pattern of responses is somewhat like that of Passaic, though not as pronounced.

The "sense of duty" reaction is more important in Houston than is the motivation to "help people," and it is almost as important in San Bernardino (where, in turn, the "enjoyment" response is relatively low), in Kansas City, and Denver.

The hope that volunteering would lead to a paying job is claimed to have been a major factor by only few respondents in all the SMSA's though, given the overall pattern, it is somewhat higher in San Francisco and Los Angeles than elsewhere.

Those who said that they "couldn't refuse when asked" vary from 6.4 percent in San Bernardino (and 7.0 percent in both Anaheim and Atlanta) to a high of 25.8 percent in San Jose, 25.6 percent in Baltimore, and 22.2 percent in Milwaukee.

In Table 20, data are provided on annual volunteering hours for those who specified particular reasons. There is, indeed, some overcounting here: respondents who may have indicated two or more reasons, in this particular tabulation, would have been "counted" under each of the reasons they had mentioned since we have no way of determining which of the factors they had responded to was more important than the others. The variation, once again, is quite great. Among those who said that

Table 20

AVERAGE ANNUAL VOLUNTEERING HOURS BY REASONS FOR FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY

	To help people	Sense of duty*	Enjoyment in activity	Child in program
Anaheim	84.1	118.5	103.8	51.1
Atlanta	107.5	100.4	163.2	192.6
Baltimore	152.0	81.6	100.6	163.7
Boston	133.7	99.4	126.5	85.4
Buffalo	89.1	79.0	69.6	107.5
Chicago	107.3	89.6	115.9	95.6
Cleveland	100.5	75.7	190.8	28.7
Columbus	62.9	46.0	65.2	99.7
Dallas	180.0	146.0	165.3	152.7
Denver	64.7	53.1	74.3	89.1
Detroit	91.0	85.6	131.6	89.4
Houston	109.8	153.0	148.0	129.8
Indianapolis	94.2	62.9	152.2	124.8
Kansas City	105.6	118.2	151.8	110.2
Los Angeles	158.0	170.0	200.5	150.6
Milwaukee	55.1	75.8	76.3	115.6
Minneapolis	137.2	123.0	170.4	136.7
Nassau	117.6	124.8	127.8	120.7
New York	207.7	201.1	230.5	234.9
Newark	171.8	109.7	121.5	215.2
Passaic	208.0	213.3	216.3	137.3
Philadephia	125.0	114.5	172.3	158.7
Pittsburgh	120.3	85.2	154.9	98.4
St. Louis	161.4	163.5	174.7	217.8
San Bernardino	171.3	140.4	236.0	332.0
San Diego	163.8	43.3	158.0	106.7
San Francisco	166.3	183.0	190.6	161.2
San Jose	120.7	73.5	138.3	33.4
Seattle	133.6	65.8	117.6	173.2

Table 20 (Continued)

AVERAGE ANNUAL VOLUNTEERING HOURS BY REASONS FOR FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY

	To help people	Sense of duty*	Enjoyment in activity	Child in program
Washington, D.C.	172.9	127.9	156.1	118.1
All SMSA's	130.8	116.4	154.4	126.6
Other areas	115.2	102.7	123.6	106.7
National	123.5	109.9	139.4	118.1

*In the "sense of duty" category, we have combined those who, in fact, referred to "a sense of duty" along with those who stated, as their main reason, that they "could not refuse when asked."

they wanted to be helpful to other people, the averages range from the lows in Milwaukee (55.1 hours) and Denver (64.7 hours) to the highs of 208.0 hours in Passaic and 207.7 hours in New York.

Among respondents for whom "sense of duty" was an important motive (here, including those who said that they "couldn't refuse"--which we construe to be a version of the narrowly defined "sense of duty" answers), the high in Passaic amounts to 213.3 average hours, and the Denver low of 53.1 is lower by a factor of 4.0.

In Columbus and Buffalo (with averages of 65.2 and 69.6 hours respectively), reported enjoyment in the volunteering activities seems to have induced relatively low average time investments; in San Bernardino (average of 236.0 hours), in Passaic (216.3 hours), in New York (230.5 hours), and in Los Angeles (200.5) high time expenditures were reported.

Nor is there less variation in terms of respondents who recalled having had a child in the program when they first provided their help as non-religious volunteers: they spent only 28.7 hours in Cleveland, and 33.4 hours in San Jose--but 332.0 hours in San Bernardino, 234.9 hours in New York, 217.8 hours in St. Louis, and 215.2 hours in Newark.

On the whole, the "enjoyment" factor looms most important: it induced highest annual volunteering hours in 13 of the SMSA's, and in another 13 of them, the hours ranked second to another cited reason (and in 7 of these 13 SMSA's, it was second only in annual time yield to those who began volunteering once they had a child in the program). Only in Buffalo, where hourly averages were relatively low regardless of stated volunteering reasons, was the enjoyment "factor" associated with hourly averages lower than those for the other three explicit motives. And it ranked third in Baltimore, Newark and Seattle, higher than the "sense of duty" reason and lower than having a child in the program or the desire to help others. In turn, the presence of a child in the program was either associated with high hourly averages (in 11 SMSA's), when contrasted with the other three factors, or rather low (last in hourly averages in 3 SMSA's, and second to last in 9 of them).

The "sense of duty" as an inducer of higher time investment led to highest averages in only two of these SMSA's: Anaheim and Houston, in each instance followed by hourly averages for those who claimed activity "enjoyment." In 16 of the SMSA's, the duty factor produced lowest time averages.

The desire to help others was associated with highest volunteering hours in four SMSA's (Dallas, San Diego, Boston, and Washington, D.C.) and in each instance, "enjoyment" as a reason led to the second highest time investment; in turn, helping others yielded the lowest hourly averages in five SMSA's when compared with the other given reasons (Kansas City, Nassau-Suffolk, Houston, Milwaukee and St. Louis).

In terms of annual volunteering frequencies (Table 21), the SMSA's display somewhat less variation than in hourly averages. Thus those who want to help people, as a reason they explicitly cite, volunteer about once every two weeks in Detroit (25.4 times during the year), Anaheim (28.2 times) and Milwaukee (28.9 times), and about three times every two weeks in Passaic (73 times), but the Passaic result, in this regard, is rather exceptional.

Among respondents who selected their "sense of duty" or inability to say no as key reasons, the lowest frequency in Buffalo (18.9 times during the year) is also somewhat exceptional. For the most part, the data reveal variability between volunteering about once every two weeks and about three times every four weeks.

Table 21

REASONS FOR FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING AND ANNUAL FREQUENCY OF VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES

	To help people	Sense of duty*	Enjoyment in activity	Child in program
Anaheim	28.2	29.9	44.0	23.8
Atlanta	35.7	26.9	42.4	52.8
Baltimore	38.9	23.6	39.1	44.4
Boston	41.9	24.1	53.1	61.1
Buffalo	26.8	18.9	13.4	43.8
Chicago	39.0	35.6	53.7	38.5
Cleveland	39.8	33.3	35.1	17.0
Columbus	30.0	27.0	29.0	31.4
Dallas	41.4	25.8	43.0	36.0
Denver	40.4	33.2	31.1	57.2
Detroit	25.4	29.1	38.8	37.8
Houston	39.8	28.6	40.6	63.3
Indianapolis	36.4	28.9	53.3	44.8
Kansas City	32.1	31.4	39.1	26.7
Los Angeles	42.4	42.2	50.2	48.4
Milwaukee	28.9	29.7	41.0	41.4
Minneapolis	34.3	30.7	36.6	46.4
Nassau	45.0	46.0	51.5	41.3
New York	51.5	48.0	54.7	49.3
Newark	40.2	21.0	36.4	53.2
Passaic	73.0	47.8	60.5	69.3
Philadelphia	35.4	34.6	41.0	40.2
Pittsburgh	42.7	31.0	57.0	51.8
St. Louis	36.0	33.9	43.0	36.2
San Bernardino	44.0	39.2	53.8	66.0
San Diego	24.9	28.5	43.1	46.4
San Francisco	44.7	45.6	54.6	56.0
San Jose	34.5	29.1	36.8	16.3

Table 21 (Continued)

REASONS FOR FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS VOLUNTEERING AND ANNUAL FREQUENCY OF VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES

	To help people	Sense of duty*	Enjoyment in activity	Child in program
Seattle	41.7	26.1	43.4	42.6
Washington, D.C.	47.6	35.6	45.7	33.9
All SMSA's	37.8	33.5	43.9	40.0
Other areas	35.0	31.1	38.3	34.7
National	36.5	32.3	41.2	37.7

*In the "sense of duty" category, we have combined those who, in fact, referred to "a sense of duty" along with those who stated, as their main reason, that they "could not refuse when asked."

Reported enjoyment of volunteering and having a child in the program produce higher variations than do the other two self-imputed reasons. Those who said that they enjoyed their work volunteered only about 14 times during the year in Buffalo (once every four weeks), twice every three weeks in Passaic, and just about every week in Boston, Chicago, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, Nassau, New York, Pittsburgh, San Bernardino, San Francisco.

The lowest volunteering frequency, 17 times during the year, among those with children involved in the progrom, occurs in Cleveland and San Jose (16.3 times); the highest frequencies were reported from Boston (61.1 times), Houston (63.3 times), San Bernardino (66.0 times) and Denver (57.2 times).

Volunteering frequency is clearly affected by the respondent's enjoyment (in 14 SMSA's this yields the highest, and in 12, the second highest, frequency) and by having children in the given program (in 13 SMSA's, this produces the highest average number of volunteering occasions during the year).

"Enjoyment" as a factor leads to lowest frequencies of volunteering only in Buffalo and Denver, and second lowest (with "sense of duty" being lower than "enjoyment") in Columbus and Newark.

Willingness to help other people is associated with highest volunteering frequencies in three SMSA's only: Cleveland, Passaic, and Washington D.C.; and with lowest frequencies, contrasted with the other reason groups, in four SMSA's: Detroit, Milwaukee, San Diego, and San Francisco.

The self-estimated "sense of duty" leads to highest annual volunteering occasions in no SMSA; and in only two of them (Anaheim and Nassau-Suffolk) is it second (in each instance, to "enjoyment" as a factor).

By major reasons for initial volunteering, Table 22 contains the result in terms of calculated average hours each volunteer reported to have spent on each of the volunteering occasions during the year. Respondents who sought to help others averaged 6.6 hours each time in San Diego: and though they volunteered, by and large, about once every two weeks, the annual hourly average was high--and higher than any of the other reasons cited for volunteering.

In Milwaukee, 1.9 hours were spent on each occasion, and because the Milwaukee participants also tended to become involved just about once every two weeks, the annual average is lower than that of San Diego by a factor of 3.

With 1.6 average hours per volunteering event in Denver, the volunteers worked about eight out of every ten weeks.

In Denver, the "sense of duty" as a motive led to low average time investment per volunteering event (1.6 hours). Coupled with relatively low volunteering frequency, the overall time effort was rather low (some 53.1 hours per volunteer during the year). The feeling of obligation was quite important in Houston: while those who reported it average about one activity every two weeks, the high annual time spent leads to high average for each such volunteering occasion (of 5.3 hours). Dallas, in this regard, is quite similar to the Houston pattern, as is Newark.

In Milwaukee, the time-per-event for those who claimed "enjoyment" among the important reasons is as low as that for those who were trying to be helpful to others (1.9 hours). But those who enjoyed their volunteering did it much more often (about 41 times during the year) than did those with the more altruistic reason which they had reported. In Buffalo, on the other hand, the hourly average per occasion is quite high (5.2 hours): but these volunteers participated only about once every four weeks.

Table 22

AVERAGE HOURS OF VOLUNTEERING PER EACH ANNUAL VOLUNTEERING OCCASION BY REASONS FOR FIRST NON-RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT

	To help people	Sense of duty	Enjoyment in activity	Child in program
Anaheim	3.0	4.0	2.4	2.1
Atlanta	3.0	3.7	3.8	3.6
Baltimore	3.9	3.4	2.6	3.7
Boston	3.2	4.1	2.4	1.4
Buffalo	3.3	4.2	5.2	2.4
Chicago	2.8	2.5	3.3	2.5
Cleveland	2.5	2.3	5.4	1.7
Columbus	2.1	1.7	2.2	3.2
Dallas	4.4	5.6	3.8	4.2
Denver	1.6	1.6	2.4	1.6
Detroit	3.6	2.9	3.4	2.4
Houston	2.8	5.3	3.6	2.0
Indianapolis	2.6	2.2	2.8	2.8
Kansas City	3.3	3.8	3.9	4.1
Los Angeles	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.1
Milwaukee	1.9	2.6	1.9	2.8
Minneapolis	4.0	4.0	4.6	2.9
Nassau	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.9
New York	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.8
Newark	4.3	5.2	3.3	4.0
Passaic	2.8	4.5	3.6	5.2
Philadelphia	3.5	3.3	4.2	3.9
Pittsburgh	2.8	2.7	2.7	1.9
St. Louis	4.5	4.8	4.1	6.0
San Bernardino	3.9	3.6	4.4	5.0
San Diego	6.6	1.5	3.7	2.3
San Francisco	3.7	4.0	3.5	2.9
San Jose	3.5	2.5	3.8	2.0
Seattle	3.2	2.5	2.7	4.1
Washington, D.C.	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.5
All SMSA's	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.2
Other areas	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1
National	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.1

Among those with children in the program, St. Louis yielded a high average of 6.0 hours each time; with 36 annual volunteerings, almost 218 hours were spent by each volunteer during the year. San Bernardino volunteers participated 66 times during the year--and having invested about 5 hours on each occasion, their overall annual average was 332 hours, the highest, by far, among the SMSA's. With 5.2 hours per occasion in Passaic, the respondents who indicated that having a child in the program was a factor, volunteered just about once every two weeks (as compared with almost twice every three weeks in San Bernardino).

At the other extreme, 61 volunteering occasions were involved among the Bostonians, but only about an hour-and-a-half each time. In Cleveland, with 17 reported average occasions among those with children in the program, only about 1.7 hours were spent each time.

If we now divide the 30 SMSA's into three groupings of ten ranks each, a summary of the pattern of

*percentages of volunteers in each reason category

*average annual hours in each reason category, and

*average annual volunteering frequency in each reason category

can be given as in Table 23.

The patterns of Table 23, complex though they seem, are easy to interpret. For instance, the "Higher-Higher-Higher" pattern for those who mentioned their desire to help others as an important reason for volunteering means that there were many such volunteers (who gave this as a reason); that they spent, on the average, many hours during the year, and on many volunteering occasions. For these individuals who sought to help others, the "H-H-H" pattern then occurs in Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., and San Bernardino SMSA's. Among those who reported a sense of duty as a reason, the pattern characterizes the respondents in San Bernardino and Passaic; for respondents with children in the program in which they began their non-religious volunteering, the "H-H-H" pattern appears only in San Francisco; and for those who cited "enjoyment," in San Francisco and Passaic.

Across all 30 of these SMSA's, percentages of volunteers in each reason category are uncorrelated with average annual time investment; they are also uncorrelated with annual volunteering frequency, except for those who mentioned "enjoyment" as an important factor. In turn, average hours and average annual frequencies yield high correlations for those

Table 23

RESPONSE PATTERNS IN EACH OF 30 SMSA'S BY REASONS FOR INITIAL VOLUNTEERING

Percentage Volunteers	Annual Hours	Annual Frequency	SMSA's in Each Pattern and Reason			
			Helping people	Sense of Duty	Child in program	Enjoyment
Higher	Higher	Higher	San Bernardino Los Angeles Washington, D.C.	San Bernardino Passaic	San Francisco	San Francisco Passaic
Higher	Higher	Medium	St. Louis	St. Louis	Seattle Baltimore	St. Louis Philadelphia
Higher	Medium	Higher	Pittsburgh	---	---	Nassau
Medium	Higher	Higher	New York San Francisco	New York Nassau Los Angeles Washington, D.C.	Atlanta Newark	New York Los Angeles
Higher	Medium	Medium	---	---	Milwaukee Nassau	Washington, D.C. Atlanta
Medium	Higher	Medium	Dallas	---	---	---
Medium	Medium	Higher	Boston Nassau	Chicago Philadelphia	Los Angeles Houston	Pittsburgh
Medium	Medium	Medium	Atlanta	Kansas City Detroit	Minneapolis	Houston
Lower	Higher	Higher	Passaic	Dallas San Francisco	San Bernardino New York	San Bernardino
Higher	Higher	Lower	---	Houston	Dallas St. Louis	---
Higher	Lower	Higher	---	---	Denver	---
Higher	Lower	Medium	Chicago Indianapolis	Milwaukee San Jose Denver	Chicago San Diego	Milwaukee
Higher	Medium	Lower	Philadelphia	Boston	---	Indianapolis

Table 23 (Continued)

RESPONSE PATTERNS IN EACH OF 30 SMSA'S BY REASONS FOR INITIAL VOLUNTEERING

Percentage Volunteers	Annual Hours	Annual Frequency	SMSA's in Each Pattern and Reason			
			Helping people	Sense of Duty	Child in Program	Enjoyment
Medium	Lower	Higher	---	---	---	Chicago
Lower	Higher	Medium	Newark	---	Philadelphia	Dallas
Lower	Medium	Higher	Seattle	---	Passaic	---
Lower	Higher	Lower	San Diego	---	---	Cleveland Minneapolis
Higher	Lower	Lower	Anaheim Columbus	Seattle Baltimore	---	Newark
Lower	Lower	Higher	---	---	Boston Pittsburgh	Boston
Medium	Medium	Lower	San Jose	Newark	Washington, D.C.	Kansas City
Medium	Lower	Medium	---	---	---	Seattle
Lower	Medium	Medium	Houston Baltimore	Anaheim Minneapolis Pittsburgh	Indianapolis Buffalo	San Diego
Medium	Lower	Lower	Milwaukee Detroit	Buffalo	Columbus Detroit San Jose Anaheim	Columbus Denver Baltimore Detroit
Lower	Medium	Lower	Minneapolis	Atlanta	Kansas City	San Jose
Lower	Lower	Medium	Cleveland Denver	Cleveland	---	Anaheim
Lower	Lower	Lower	Buffalo Kansas City	Columbus San Diego Indianapolis	Cleveland	Buffalo

*On each of the three variables, the ten highest ranking SMSA's were labeled here "higher." The SMSA's with lowest ranks, "lower."

who volunteered out of a sense of duty (rho = .648) and for those who wanted to help people (rho = .612), while the other two correlations, positive as they are, turn out to be more modest.

Table 24 summarizes the rank-order correlation analysis of the data to provide a single overview of the information.

Table 24

RANK-ORDER CORRELATIONS FOR 30 SMSA'S: PERCENTAGES OF VOLUNTEERS (BY REASON), ANNUAL HOURS (BY REASON), AND ANNUAL FREQUENCIES (BY REASON)

REASON FOR INITIAL INVOLVEMENT	Correlations of		
	Percentages with annual hours	Percentages with annual frequencies	Annual hours with annual frequencies
To help people	+.112	+.072	+.612
Out of a sense of duty (or because respondent cannot refuse when asked)	+.036	+.017	+.648
Child in program	+.003	-.013	+.390
Enjoyment of voluntary activity	+.071	+.313	+.425

Thus there is an indication that those who considered "enjoyment" an important reason tend to volunteer more often, but compared with those who act out of a sense of duty or because they want to help others, they spend less time. The low correlations of both frequencies and average hours with percentages of volunteers across these SMSA's simply indicate that numbers of volunteers themselves do not lead to particularly high volunteering frequencies or high time investment--and that, since the correlations hover around zero, in some SMSA's with many volunteers, frequencies and hours are also high, while in other SMSA's with many volunteers, hours and annual frequencies tend to be low. A detailed scrutiny of the data in Table 23 allows an easy identification of these SMSA's especially where the patterns are most pronounced: "Higher-Higher-Higher," "Higher-Lower-Lower," "Lower-Higher-Higher" and "Lower-Lower-Lower."

VIII. PLANS TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING

Of the 1973-1974 volunteers, almost 85 percent planned to continue their activities during the following year. The percentage is somewhat higher in the 106 identified SMSA's than it is in other SMSA's and other sampling areas of the Bureau of the Census ACTION study.

Table 25 gives the results for all the SMSA's regardless of the size of the volunteer force in these locations. The range is from 100 percent (generally in SMSA's with very few respondents, however) to 42.9 percent in Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania (with only 7 respondents) and 50 percent in Spokane, Washington (though with 8 respondents only).

In the 30 SMSA's on which we have focused in greater detail throughout our analysis, future volunteering intentions vary from 94.6 percent in San Bernardino, 93.5 percent in Passaic, 92.2 percent in Washington,D.C., 91.2 percent in Cleveland, and 90.6 percent in Indianapolis to the low of 71.6 percent in Pittsburgh, 75.0 percent in Newark, and 77.6 percent in Boston.

In those SMSA's for which we have at least 10 respondents who were volunteers during the year which had ended in April, 1974 but did not plan to continue their activities, the reasons for discontinuing their involvement are given in Table 26.

The catch-all category of "other" reasons was selected by far most often. While we do not have the data to bear this out directly, prominent among these "other" reasons would obviously be lack of time, ill health or other disability, and of course, age itself.

Respondents who have thought of discontinuing their voluntary involvement because the project in which they had participated had ended, or was about to end, obviously might again become volunteers once they find an appropriate activity in which to invest their time and effort. Similarly, those who get a paying job are not likely to stop their voluntary work completely once their job activities get more routinized, and once they find a suitable outlet for their volunteering again. Residential change, too, disrupts the patterns of normalcy and routine with which

Table 25

PERCENTAGES OF 1973-1974 VOLUNTEERS WHO PLAN TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT PLANNING TO CONTINUE	(N)
Akron	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	78.9	19
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	New York	MA	E	II	84.6	26
*Anaheim-Santa Anna-Garden Grove	California	P	W	IX	85.5	62
Appleton-Oshkosh	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	88.9	9
*Atlanta	Georgia	SA	S	IV	87.8	49
Austin	Texas	WSC	S	VI	80.0	5
Bakersfield	California	P	W	IX	100.0	6
*Baltimore	Maryland	SA	S	IV	80.8	52
Baton Rouge	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	78.6	14
Beaumont-Pt Arthur-Orange	Texas	WSC	S	VI	80.0	5
Birmingham	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	94.1	17
*Boston	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	77.6	49
Bridgeport	Connecticut	NE	E	I	78.6	14
*Buffalo	New York	MA	E	IV	88.4	43
Canton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	90.0	10
Charleston	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	100.0	7
Charlotte	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	65.2	23
*Chicago	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	81.4	145

Table 25 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF 1973-1974 VOLUNTEERS WHO PLAN TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT PLANNING TO CONTINUE	(N)
*Cleveland	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	91.2	34
Columbia	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	75.0	12
*Columbus	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	83.3	30
Corpus Christi	Texas	WSC	S	VI	100.0	10
*Dallas	Texas	WSC	S	VI	86.3	51
Dayton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	100.0	17
*Denver	Colorado	RM	W	VIII	83.7	49
Des Moines	Iowa	WNC	NC	VII	93.3	15
*Detroit	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	79.4	102
El Paso	Texas	WSC	S	VI	86.7	15
Erie	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	80.0	10
Flint	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	83.3	12
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood	Florida	SA	S	IV	73.7	19
Fort Wayne	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	55.6	9
Fort Worth	Texas	WSC	S	VI	76.5	17
Fresno	California	P	W	IX	78.6	14
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	90.0	10
Grand Rapids	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	92.9	14
High Point	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	76.2	21

Table 25 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF 1973-1974 VOLUNTEERS WHO PLAN TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT PLANNING TO CONTINUE	(N)
Greenville	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	60.0	5
Harrisburg	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	100.0	19
Hartford	Connecticut	NE	E	I	57.1	7
Honolulu	Hawaii	P	W	IX	100.0	6
*Houston	Texas	WSC	S	VI	89.2	37
*Indianapolis	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	90.6	53
Jackson	Mississippi	ESC	S	IV	50.0	6
Jacksonville	Florida	SA	S	IV	92.9	14
Jersey City	New Jersey	MA	E	II	50.0	6
Johnstown	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	100.0	7
*Kansas City	Missouri-Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	88.1	42
Knoxville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	75.0	20
Lancaster	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	72.2	18
Lansing	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	88.9	9
Little Rock-North Little Rock	Arkansas	WSC	S	VI	50.0	8
Lorain-Elyria	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	95.0	20
*Los Angeles-Long Beach	California	P	W	IX	83.9	168
Madison	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	100.0	7
Miami	Florida	SA	S	IV	78.6	14
*Milwaukee	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	80.0	40

Table 25 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF 1973-1974 VOLUNTEERS WHO PLAN TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT PLANNING TO CONTINUE	(N)
*Minneapolis-St. Paul	Minnesota	WNC	NC	V	86.8	76
Mobile	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	63.6	11
Nashville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	81.8	11
*Nassau-Suffolk	New York	MA	E	II	81.4	43
New Haven	Connecticut	NE	E	I	100.0	9
New Orleans	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	92.3	13
*New York	New York	MA	E	II	86.7	113
*Newark	New Jersey	MA	E	II	75.0	44
Newport News-Hampton	Virginia	SA	S	III	100.0	6
Norfolk-Portsmouth	Virginia	SA	S	III	72.0	25
Oklahoma City	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	75.0	16
Orlando	Florida	SA	S	IV	66.7	12
Oxnard-Ventura	California	P	W	IX	100.0	9
*Patterson-Clifton-Passaic	New Jersey	MA	E	II	93.5	31
Peoria	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	93.8	16
*Philadelphia	Pennsylvania-New Jersey	MA	E	III	89.4	123
Phoenix	Arizona	RM	W	IX	96.0	25
*Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	71.6	74
Reading	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	77.8	9
Richmond	Virginia	SA	S	III	85.0	20

Table 25 (Continued)

PERCENTAGE OF 1973-1974 VOLUNTEERS WHO PLAN TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT PLANNING TO CONTINUE	(N)
Rochester	New York	MA	E	II	87.0	23
Rockford	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	71.4	14
Sacramento	California	P	W	IX	66.7	27
*St. Louis	Missouri-Illinois	WNC	NC	VII	86.5	96
Salinas-Monterey	California	P	W	IX	100.0	3
San Antonio	Texas	WSC	S	VI	85.7	14
*San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario	California	P	W	IX	94.6	37
*San Diego	California	P	W	IX	85.0	40
*San Francisco-Oakland	California	P	W	IX	83.1	83
*San Jose	California	P	W	IX	81.1	33
Santa Barbara	California	P	W	IX	100.0	15
*Seattle-Everett	Washington	P	W	X	84.6	65
Shreveport	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	100.0	6
South Bend	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	70.0	10
Spokane	Washington	P	W	IX	50.0	8
Stockton	California	P	W	X	66.7	6
Syracuse	New York	MA	E	II	73.3	15
Tacoma	Washington	P	W	X	94.7	19
Tampa-St. Petersburg	Florida	SA	S	IV	90.0	20
Trenton	New Jersey	MA	E	II	90.0	10
Tulsa	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	91.7	12

Table 25 (Continued)

PERCENTAGE OF 1973-1974 VOLUNTEERS WHO PLAN TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT PLANNING TO CONTINUE	(N)
Utica-Rome	New York	MA	E	II	87.5	8
*Washington, D.C.	Maryland-Virginia	SA	S	III	92.2	77
West Palm Beach	Florida	SA	S	IV	63.6	11
Wichita	Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	71.4	7
Wilkes Barre-Hazelton	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	42.9	7
Worcester	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	90.0	10
York	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	100.0	7
Youngstown-Warren	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	75.0	16
All 106 SMSA's					85.2	2,907
All Other Areas					83.8	2,720
National					84.5	5,627

CENSUS DIVISIONS:
NE New England
MA Middle Atlantic
ENC East North Central
WNC West North Central
SA South Atlantic
ESC East South Central
WSC West South Central
RM (Rocky) Mountain
P Pacific

CENSUS REGIONS: E Northeast NC North Central S South W West

ACTION REGIONS: I through X

*SMSA's on which we have been performing more detailed analysis throughout (N ≥ 30) are marked with an asterisk throughout the Table.

Table 26

REASONS FOR NOT PLANNING TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING BEYOND APRIL, 1974

	(N)	Project ended	No useful work	Poor supervis.	No pers. rewards	Child not in program	Got a job	Moved away	Other
Baltimore	10	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	70.0
Boston	11	18.2	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	45.5
Chicago	27	22.2	3.7	0.0	3.7	7.4	14.[illegible]	14.8	55.6
Detroit	21	23.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	4.8	9.5	14.3	52.4
Los Angeles	27	7.4	3.7	0.0	3.7	3.7	11.1	0.0	66.7
Minneapolis	10	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	60.0
New York	15	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	20.0	6.7	53.3
Newark	11	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	0.0	36.4
Philadelphia	13	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	23.1	7.7	53.8
Pittsburgh	21	19.0	9.5	4.8	4.8	9.5	0.0	0.0	47.6
St. Louis	13	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	15.4	7.7	7.7	61.5
San Francisco	14	42.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	42.9
Seattle	10	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	80.0

most people are surrounded, or even, surround themselves. But the interruption is temporary, and those who liked what they were doing as volunteers will tend to find opportunities in their new setting, at least in time.

For the most part, then, we think that it is the "other" reasons which disclose the most probable attrition of the volunteer force, rather than any of the reasons which were explicitly cited. Of course, some counterflow is also probable: some of those who have plans to continue volunteering may find it impossible to carry out their intentions. Some will change residences; some will acquire family obligations which they did not expect; some will become ill; some further volunteering projects will come to an end; and so on. Furthermore, the pool of 1973-1974 non-volunteers is, of course, much larger than the percentages of actual volunteers. If only relatively few of them were to become volunteers, the overall effect is likely to be to produce a volunteer force in the period after the ACTION study at least as large as that of the 1973-1974 period.

IX. REASONS FOR CONTINUED VOLUNTEERING

In Table 27, we provide the stated reasons for continued volunteering on the part of those who did intend to sustain their activities beyond the April, 1974, period.

"Helping others," on the whole, turns out to be even more important as a factor in continuation of voluntary activities than it is as a reason to become involved in the first place. This is so in the aggregate of national data, as it is both in the identified 106 SMSA's and in the other sampling areas. In 21 of the 30 SMSA's on which more detail has been presented in Table 27 (as it was in previous tabulations), the desire to help is more important for continued volunteering than it is even for the first entry. In Anaheim, Atlanta, Columbus, Milwaukee, Nassau-Suffolk, Patterson-Clifton-Passaic, Pittsburgh, San Jose, and Washington, D.C. it is somewhat less important. The feeling of an obligation, a sense of duty, is also more important in activity continuation than onset. Except in Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Milwaukee, San Bernardino, San Jose, Seattle and Washington, D.C. this holds for all the remaining SMSA's.

In turn, having a child in the program is a more potent reason for entering the field of volunteer activity than it is for continuing it. Only in Atlanta, Boston, Buffalo, Indianapolis, Kansas City and Newark does this factor seem to be even more relevant to activity continuation than to the entry into volunteerism.

Finally, in all these SMSA's (save for San Jose where the percentages are just about equal), the satisfaction which the individual derives from volunteering, the capacity to enjoy the activity, is more important among those who plan to continue their involvement than as a factor in initial participation among the 1973-1974 volunteers.

In SMSA's where many respondents gave a sense of duty, or inability to say "no" when asked, as a key reason for the entry into

Table 27

REASONS FOR PLANS TO CONTINUE VOLUNTARY ACTIVITY

	To help people	Sense of duty	Couldn't refuse	Child in program	Nothing else to do	Enjoyment	Hope for job	Other
Anaheim	50.9	17.0	7.5	8.7	0.0	35.8	0.0	1.9
Atlanta	46.5	30.2	11.6	27.9	2.3	62.8	2.3	11.6
Baltimore	45.2	31.0	11.9	33.3	4.8	52.4	2.4	4.8
Boston	56.4	48.7	12.8	17.9	5.1	48.7	2.6	2.6
Buffalo	44.7	42.1	15.8	21.1	0.0	44.7	2.6	2.6
Chicago	63.6	28.8	13.6	24.6	2.5	42.4	2.5	13.6
Cleveland	48.4	35.5	3.2	12.9	3.2	48.4	0.0	3.2
Columbus	60.0	32.0	4.0	32.0	0.0	48.0	0.0	4.0
Dallas	47.7	34.1	9.1	5.9	2.3	47.7	0.0	18.2
Denver	56.1	41.5	2.4	14.6	0.0	35.3	4.9	4.9
Detroit	59.3	22.2	3.7	19.8	2.5	51.9	6.2	4.9
Houston	54.5	39.4	9.1	18.2	0.0	48.5	3.0	9.1
Indianapolis	60.4	35.4	10.4	12.5	0.0	52.1	0.0	8.3
Kansas City	59.5	40.5	10.8	24.3	0.0	35.1	0.0	0.0
Los Angeles	60.6	40.1	12.7	16.9	1.4	43.7	5.6	9.9
Milwaukee	50.0	50.0	9.4	21.9	0.0	46.9	0.0	0.0
Minneapolis	65.2	28.8	10.6	12.1	6.1	56.1	0.0	12.1
Nassau	42.9	44.4	5.7	25.7	0.0	65.7	2.9	2.9
New York	59.2	35.7	6.1	14.3	7.1	37.8	4.1	5.1
Newark	45.5	30.3	12.1	30.3	3.0	54.5	3.0	6.1

Table 27 (continued)

REASONS FOR PLANS TO CONTINUE VOLUNTARY ACTIVITY

	To help people	Sense of duty	Couldn't refuse	Child in program	Nothing else to do	Enjoyment	Hope for Job	Other
Passaic	34.5	51.7	17.2	10.3	3.4	51.7	0.0	0.0
Philadelphia	63.6	37.3	10.0	11.8	2.7	43.6	0.0	8.2
Pittsburgh	51.8	48.2	12.5	12.5	0.0	55.4	1.8	5.4
St. Louis	74.7	47.0	16.9	25.3	1.2	59.0	2.4	8.4
San Bernardino	65.7	34.3	11.4	14.3	0.0	31.4	0.0	8.6
San Diego	47.1	29.4	8.8	23.5	2.9	35.3	0.0	5.9
San Francisco	65.2	31.9	5.8	20.3	4.3	55.1	4.3	13.0
San Jose	40.7	33.3	33.3	22.2	0.0	33.3	0.0	11.1
Seattle	54.5	34.5	7.3	12.7	9.1	43.6	10.9	9.1
Washington, D.C.	56.9	36.1	9.7	20.8	1.4	51.4	2.8	11.1
All SMSA's	57.5	36.7	10.8	18.0	2.2	47.1	2.5	7.6
Other areas	61.3	39.4	11.8	15.1	2.4	50.8	2.3	4.3
National	59.4	38.0	11.3	16.6	2.3	48.9	2.4	6.0

volunteering, many also gave that reason as a factor in their plans to continue; rho = .628 for these 30 SMSA's.

Similarly, where many had sought to "help others" when they began volunteering, many respondents also tended to cite this motive as important in continued activity. But the "enjoyment" factor yields a low correlation only, rho = .178, so that we have some indication of a degree of volatility of satisfaction with volunteering due to its enjoyability when viewed as a component of the decision to become a participant as compared with a decision to remain a volunteer.

Of course, we already know that in all the SMSA's "enjoyment" was more frequently referred to as a factor in continued volunteering than in voluntarism's onset. But the result means that the ordering of the SMSA's relative to these two time frames underwent important changes.

Table 28

RANK-ORDER CORRELATIONS OF 30 SMSA'S BY INITIAL REASONS AND BY REASONS FOR CONTINUATION

Percentages of those who	Rho
Initially wanted to help others and those who give this reason for continuing	.525
Initially volunteered out of a sense of duty and those who give this reason for continuing	.628
Initially gave as reason "having a child in the program" and those giving this as a reason to continue	.441
Initially gave enjoyment as reason and those giving this as a reason to continue	.178

If we consider the percentages of those who have continuing volunteering plans and the percentages of respondents giving particular reasons for continued volunteering, we find that two of the explicit motives have positive, though low, correlations among the SMSA's: desire to help others, and a sense of duty. Two of the correlations are negative: having a child in the program, and "enjoyment" as a reason for continued volunteer work.

Table 29

RANK-ORDER CORRELATIONS OF 30 SMSA'S BY PERCENTAGE PLANNING TO CONTINUE AND REASONS GIVEN FOR ONGOING VOLUNTEERING

Percentage of Those Who Plan to Continue with	Rho
Percentage of those who gave their desire to help others as reason for continued volunteering	+.159
Percentage of those who gave their sense of duty as reason for continued volunteering	+.068
Percentage of those who gave having a child in the program as a reason	-.384
Percentage of those who gave enjoyment as a reason for continued volunteering	-.188

Thus there is a tendency in these SMSA's to have a higher relative frequency of continued volunteering plans the fewer respondents propose to maintain their activity either because they have a child in the program or because their own enjoyment is a major motive. Both of these factors are of the personal, individual, variety. In turn, the two reasons which yield positive, though low, correlations are both transcending the individual's own immediate perspective or setting: the desire to help others, a sense of obligation are both motives which involve socialization to societal, rather than primarily personal, standards.

A comparison of the results of Table 20 with those of Table 30 shows that, in all 106 SMSA's, some 13 hours more, on the average, were spent in volunteer work by those who intended to continue volunteering than by all 1973-1974 volunteers if their reasons to continue were a desire to help people. More hours were also spent by those who planned to continue out of a sense of duty, or because

Table 30

AVERAGE VOLUNTEERING HOURS, 1973 - 1974, FOR THOSE WHO PLAN TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING AND BY REASONS FOR CONTUNUED ACTIVITY

	To help others	Sense of duty	Enjoyment	Having child in program
Anaheim	85.6	115.4	137.4	107.5
Atlanta	171.3	171.5	129.2	182.3
Baltimore	184.9	75.1	144.2	135.6
Boston	162.7	147.3	134.7	156.4
Buffalo	76.8	88.6	120.0	77.8
Chicago	107.8	137.0	120.5	100.3
Cleveland	97.2	75.7	154.9	118.5
Columbus	78.8	70.4	98.7	124.8
Dallas	171.7	166.4	159.4	166.8
Denver	57.7	59.9	74.4	91.3
Detroit	135.7	130.1	124.2	70.4
Houston	110.9	69.3	160.9	99.7
Indianapolis	104.7	91.9	141.4	174.0
Kansas City	103.2	102.5	151.8	115.8
Los Angeles	171.9	192.2	187.4	146.2
Milwaukee	109.5	86.4	100.1	153.4
Minneapolis	133.4	102.2	150.1	66.8
Nassau	143.4	137.4	132.2	45.3
New York	223.5	188.0	243.4	226.6
Newark	189.7	143.2	123.1	201.4

Table 30 (continued)

	To help others	Sense of duty	Enjoyment	Having child in program
Passaic	192.6	125.9	251.6	256.7
Philadelphia	125.0	122.9	173.2	209.8
Pittsburgh	122.4	100.3	120.5	74.6
St. Louis	180.5	172.9	196.4	205.8
San Bernardino	178.0	138.7	255.4	131.2
San Diego	217.4	151.2	166.7	112.2
San Francisco	208.6	181.0	218.3	168.7
San Jose	110.5	41.2	157.6	68.3
Seattle	142.0	86.9	114.9	236.0
Washington, D.C.	170.1	135.9	193.0	79.6
All SMSA's	143.4	129.8	153.2	129.2
Other areas	114.2	112.1	120.6	111.2
National	128.7	120.8	138.0	121.2

they had a child in the particular program. Those who valued enjoyment as important in affecting plans for continued activities tended to give just about as much time as did those who thought that they might be unable, or unwilling, to keep up their volunteering effort.

Even so, in 20 of the 30 SMSA's which we have studied in more detail here, the "enjoyers" yielded higher hourly averages among those who did plan to continue their volunteering; and in two additional SMSA's (Kansas City and Denver), the time investment averages were the same.

The pattern for frequencies of annual volunteering (Table 31) is essentially the same one. Those who had plans to continue volunteering tended to have worked at their projects on more occasions during 1973-1974 than did those who reported that their activities might be discontinued, when initial and continuation reasons were the desire to help others, sense of duty, or involvement in a child's Program. Enjoyment, once again, led to a similar result for those who did, and for those who did not, claim continued volunteering as their plan.

Given, finally, in Table 32 are the average hours the volunteers imply to have spent on each occasion when they planned to continue volunteering, and for the specified reasons. These averages, for the nation as a whole as well as for the SMSA's in toto (N=106) are essentially the same as those which we reported in Table 22 for all volunteers, regardless of continuation plans.

But this is a result of many trade-offs, as the inspection of the more detailed data (a comparison of Tables 22 and 32) reveals. In Anaheim, for instance, some 3 hours were spent on each volunteering occasion by those who said that the desire to help people was an important reason for initial volunteering; 1.8 hours were spent by the Anaheim respondents with continued volunteerism plans who defined helping others as a factor in their decision to continue. By the same token, when the initial reason included "sense of duty," some 4 hours were invested by Anaheim volunteers - but almost 6 hours for the corresponding respondents with continuation plans.

In Minneapolis, regardless of reason given for initial or for continued volunteering, those with plans to continue averaged fewer

Table 31

ANNUAL VOLUNTEERING FREQUENCIES FOR THOSE WHO PLANNED TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING BY REASONS FOR CONTINUED ACTIVITY

	To help others	Sense of duty	Enjoyment	Having child in program
Anaheim	48.9	20.3	42.4	27.3
Atlanta	33.8	37.9	33.1	46.2
Baltimore	37.5	26.1	42.0	44.4
Boston	42.2	38.6	39.0	53.7
Buffalo	27.8	28.3	26.8	18.8
Chicago	38.2	48.4	46.1	40.6
Cleveland	37.1	29.7	42.3	30.0
Columbus	35.3	35.3	28.1	36.8
Dallas	46.2	37.2	45.1	38.4
Denver	34.7	32.0	38.0	61.3
Detroit	32.9	33.4	32.7	28.4
Houston	36.3	36.7	40.5	71.3
Indianapolis	40.0	36.5	56.2	51.7
Kansas City	30.4	32.4	41.1	26.7
Los Angeles	45.8	47.0	47.4	54.6
Milwaukee	39.8	36.9	41.7	56.3
Minneapolis	34.9	31.4	39.9	35.1
Nassau	52.2	52.3	49.1	38.9
New York	51.5	45.4	63.6	49.5
Newark	43.7	37.6	34.3	43.6

Table 31 (continued)

	To help others	Sense of duty	Enjoyment	Having child in program
Passaic	60.8	43.9	63.1	86.7
Philadelphia	32.0	35.8	38.2	39.1
Pittsburgh	39.3	42.5	44.2	62.8
St. Louis	34.8	33.6	42.2	35.9
San Bernardino	43.8	44.1	44.5	29.4
San Diego	45.1	48.8	51.5	50.8
San Francisco	51.0	46.4	54.0	52.2
San Jose	32.6	18.7	32.7	41.7
Seattle	36.4	26.5	41.2	43.7
Washington, D.C.	50.4	33.9	50.1	33.6
All SMSA's	38.9	36.1	43.4	40.2
Other areas	35.9	34.8	37.9	36.9
National	37.4	35.4	40.6	38.7

Table 32

AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEERING OCCASION ON THE PART OF THOSE WHO HAVE PLANS TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING AND BY REASONS FOR CONTINUED INVOLVEMENT

	To help others	Sense of duty	Enjoyment	Having child in program
Anaheim	1.8	5.7	3.2	3.9
Atlanta	5.1	4.5	3.9	3.9
Baltimore	4.9	2.9	3.4	3.0
Boston	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.9
Buffalo	2.8	3.1	4.5	4.1
Chicago	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.5
Cleveland	2.6	2.5	3.7	4.0
Columbus	2.2	2.0	3.5	3.4
Dallas	3.7	4.5	3.5	4.3
Denver	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.5
Detroit	4.1	3.9	3.8	2.5
Houston	3.0	1.9	4.0	1.4
Indianapolis	2.6	2.5	2.5	3.4
Kansas City	3.4	3.2	3.7	4.3
Los Angeles	3.8	4.1	4.0	2.7
Milwaukee	2.8	2.3	2.4	2.7
Minneapolis	3.8	3.2	3.8	1.9
Nassau	2.7	2.6	2.7	1.2
New York	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.6
Newark	4.3	3.8	3.6	4.6

Table 32 (continued)

	To help others	Sense of duty	Enjoyment	Having child in program
Passaic	3.0	2.9	4.0	3.0
Philadelphia	3.9	3.4	4.5	5.4
Pittsburgh	3.1	2.4	2.7	1.2
St. Louis	5.2	5.1	4.6	5.7
San Bernardino	4.1	3.1	5.7	4.5
San Diego	4.8	3.1	3.2	2.2
San Francisco	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.2
San Jose	3.4	2.2	4.8	1.6
Seattle	3.9	3.3	2.8	5.4
Washington, D.C.	3.4	4.0	3.8	2.4
All SMSA's	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.2
Other areas	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.0
National	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.1

hours per occasion than did all volunteers given their initial rationale for involvement. In Detroit, the reverse pattern is exemplified: average hours per event are higher, regardless of reason given, for those with continuation plans. This configuration also characterizes the Atlanta SMSA, as it does Columbus and Seattle SMSA's.

Among volunteers with plans to continue, the annual frequencies of volunteering and average annual hours yield relatively high, and positive, rank correlations across the 30 SMSA's (Table 33). This implies some degree of invariance in the average hours spent on each respective involvement occasion, a result confirmed by a close comparison of Tables 22 and 32. Roughly, it also indicates that regardless of reasons for volunteering (at least within the framework of the rationale explicitly considered here, that is, the desire to help people, sense of duty, having a child in the program, and deriving personal enjoyment out of the activity), increments in frequency of activity do not significantly induce longer time investments on each such occasion. To put it somewhat differently: volunteers can be counted on to put in a limited amount of time (of the order of two to four hours) each time they are active regardless how often they participate and regardless of their underlying motivations.

Table 33

RANK-ORDER CORRELATIONS FOR 30 SMSA'S BETWEEN ANNUAL VOLUNTEERING HOURS AND ANNUAL VOLUNTEERING FREQUENCIES FOR THOSE WHO PLAN TO CONTINUE VOLUNTEERING AND WHO HAVE GIVEN SPECIFIED REASONS FOR CONTINUED ACTIVITY

Correlations of annual hours and annual frequencies	Rho
To help others (as reason to continue)	+.541
Sense of duty (as reason to continue)	+.682
Enjoyment (as reason to continue	+.572
Having a child in the program (as reason to continue)	+.305

A different conclusion would have been drawn had the correlations been essentially zero, either for all the reasons reported or for any of them. This would have meant that while in some SMSA's, frequencies and, hours per year are positively related (with the invariance implications for time-per-occasion), in other SMSA's, the volunteers, as it were, compensate: when they distribute their annual effort over many distinct occasions, they tend to spend less time each time they do so.

While the dominant pattern is shown by the correlations of Table 33 it is clear that the coefficients disclose that at least some SMSA's may be characterized in ways different from the major outcome reported.

Thus in Anaheim, people who want to help others reported to have volunteered almost once every week: the annual hours amount to a little over 85 only.

In the Denver SMSA, volunteers who considered having a child in the program an important reason to comtinue their activity averaged 91 hours over the year - distributed among more than 60 annual occasions. In Houston, respondents with the Denver-type rationale (a child in the program) imply an average of 71 volunteering events in the year - and just about 100 hours overall.

The reverse, of course, must also hold in some SMSA's for the general result to be sustained. In St. Louis, for example, those who gave their sense of duty as an important reason in continued volunteering invested almost 173 hours in 1973-1974 on the average but only on some 34 volunteering occasions; 173 annual hours were also spent in Philadelphia by those for whom enjoyment was a factor - and they participated, on balance, 38 times during the year.

The results then, while disclosing an overall patterning in which higher frequencies of volunteering lead to higher annual time expenditures, or, at a minimum, higher frequencies are associated with higher time investments, also indicate that in many SMSA's, when considered singly, the configuration is different. And it has different implications for policy both at the national, and, especially, local levels. We shall, of course, return to the problem of policy implications in a more systematic manner in the concluding sections of our report.

X. UNACTUALIZED VOLUNTEERING INTENTIONS

Nationally, about six percent of the respondents who did no voluntary work during 1973-1974 (March through April of the respective years) considered volunteering but did not implement their intentions.

In the 106 SMSA's, 6.5 percent of the interviewees reported such considerations. Table 34 is a summary of the results for each of the 106 SMSA's.

None of the 1973-1974 year's non-volunteers had given thought to the possibility of involvement in several SMSA's: Charleston, South Carolina; Gary, Indiana; Corpus Christi, Texas; Lancaster, Pennsylvania; Madison, Wisconsin; Peoria, Illinois; and Spokane, Washington.

More than ten percent of the year's non-volunteers, however, reported volunteering intentions in Columbus, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Des Moines, Iowa; High Point area of North Carolina; Hartford, Connecticut; Lansing, Michigan; Lorain-Elyria, Ohio (just 10 percent); Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Orlando, Florida (just ten percent); Phoenix, Arizona; Sacramento, California; San Diego, California; Seattle, Washington; Syracuse, New York; Tacoma, Washington; Washington, D.C.; West Palm Beach, Florida; and York, Pennsylvania.

In all 106 SMSA's, there is a slight positive (and statistically different from zero at beyond the 105 level) correlation between percentages of people who, not having volunteered during the year, did consider volunteering and the percentage of volunteers. There is a slight, though significant (at beyond the .05 level) correlation, a negative one, between average annual hours and percentages of those who considered volunteering.

The indicators are weak but potentially important: in SMSA's with many volunteers, there exists a kind of ambience that induces the consideration of volunteering on the part of non-volunteers more than in SMSA's with fewer active volunteers. Also, the more time volunteers spend in their respective activities, the less there seems to be an incentive to consider volunteering on the part of those who, during this period, had not been engaged in it.

Table 34

THOSE WHO CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING BUT DID NOT (1973-1974)

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT WHO CONSIDERED	(N)
Akron	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	7.1	42
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	New York	MA	E	II	6.1	49
*Anaheim-Santa Anna-Garden Grove	California	P	W	IX	12.7	126
Appleton-Oshkosh	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	11.5	26
*Atlanta	Georgia	SA	S	IV	11.0	127
Austin	Texas	WSC	S	VI	10.0	20
Bakersfield	California	P	W	IX	2.8	36
*Baltimore	Maryland	SA	S	IV	5.8	173
Baton Rouge	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	4.5	22
Beaumont-Pt Arthur-Orange	Texas	WSC	S	VI	22.2	9
Birmingham	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	1.5	66
*Boston	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	6.2	259
Bridgeport	Connecticut	NE	E	I	11.8	51
*Buffalo	New York	MA	E	IV	3.7	107
Canton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	9.5	42
Charleston	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	0.0	26
Charlotte	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	3.7	54
*Chicago	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	4.2	618

Table 34 (Continued)

THOSE WHO CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING BUT DID NOT
(1973-1974)

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT WHO CONSIDERED	(N)
*Cleveland	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	6.3	159
Columbia	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	8.3	60
*Columbus	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	13.8	87
Corpus Christi	Texas	WSC	S	VI	0.0	14
*Dallas	Texas	WSC	S	VI	9.5	169
Dayton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	15.9	44
*Denver	Colorado	RM	W	VIII	5.6	89
Des Moines	Iowa	WNC	NC	VII	14.3	21
*Detroit	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	8.8	330
El Paso	Texas	WSC	S	VI	4.0	25
Erie	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	3.7	27
Flint	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	2.1	47
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood	Florida	SA	S	IV	4.4	68
Fort Wayne	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	8.3	24
Fort Worth	Texas	WSC	S	VI	6.8	73
Fresno	California	P	W	IX	7.5	67
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	0.0	57
Grand Rapids	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	9.1	55

Table 34 (Continued)

THOSE WHO CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING BUT DID NOT (1973-1974)

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT WHO CONSIDERED	(N)
High Point	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	10.2	59
Greenville	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	9.4	32
Harrisburg	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	7.1	56
Hartford	Connecticut	NE	E	I	12.1	58
Honolulu	Hawaii	P	W	IX	2.0	49
*Houston	Texas	WSC	S	VI	6.7	223
*Indianapolis	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	4.9	82
Jackson	Mississippi	ESC	S	IV	3.6	28
Jacksonville	Florida	SA	S	IV	7.3	41
Jersey City	New Jersey	MA	E	II	2.6	39
Johnstown	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	6.7	15
*Kansas City	Missouri-Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	8.4	107
Knoxville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	5.7	70
Lancaster	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	0.0	32
Lansing	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	11.6	43
Little Rock-North Little Rock	Arkansas	WSC	S	VI	6.3	48
Lorain-Elyria	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	10.0	30
*Los Angeles-Long Beach	California	P	W	IX	6.0	636
Madison	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	0.0	31
Miami	Florida	SA	S	IV	3.7	162

Table 34 (Continued)

THOSE WHO CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING BUT DID NOT (1973-1974)

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT WHO CONSIDERED	(N)
*Milwaukee	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	8.5	141
*Minneapolis-St. Paul	Minnesota	WNC	NC	V	14.0	157
Mobile	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	0.0	13
Nashville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	1.9	53
Nassau-Suffolk	New York	MA	E	II	7.3	206
New Haven	Connecticut	NE	E	I	6.9	29
New Orleans	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	4.8	83
*New York	New York	MA	E	II	2.5	810
*Newark	New Jersey	MA	E	II	4.0	173
Newport News-Hampton	Virginia	SA	S	III	3.7	27
Norfolk-Portsmouth	Virginia	SA	S	III	6.4	47
Oklahoma City	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	11.6	43
Orlando	Florida	SA	S	IV	10.0	40
Oxnard-Ventura	California	P	W	IX	6.9	29
Patterson-Clifton-Passaic	New Jersey	MA	E	II	1.1	95
Peoria	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	0.0	30
*Philadelphia	Pennsylvania-New Jersey	MA	E	III	4.0	451
Phoenix	Arizona	RM	W	IX	10.1	79
*Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	2.2	184

Table 34 (Continued)

THOSE WHO CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING BUT DID NOT
(1973-1974)

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT WHO CONSIDERED	(N)
Reading	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	4.2	24
Richmond	Virginia	SA	S	III	7.7	39
Rochester	New York	MA	E	II	1.4	74
Rockford	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	5.9	34
Sacramento	California	P	W	IX	13.8	87
*St. Louis	Missouri-Illinois	WNC	NC	VII	7.3	178
Salinas-Monterey	California	P	W	IX	0.0	11
San Antonio	Texas	WSC	S	VI	9.6	73
*San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario	California	P	W	IX	7.1	112
*San Diego	California	P	W	IX	14.0	129
*San Francisco-Oakland	California	P	W	IX	8.1	235
*San Jose	California	P	W	IX	5.7	87
Santa Barbara	California	P	W	IX	4.8	21
*Seattle-Everett	Washington	P	W	X	18.6	97
Shreveport	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	7.5	40
South Bend	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	4.5	22
Spokane	Washington	P	W	X	0.0	29
Stockton	California	P	W	IX	5.7	35
Syracuse	New York	MA	E	II	15.0	40

Table 34 (Continued)

THOSE WHO CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING BUT DID NOT
(1973-1974)

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	PERCENT WHO CONSIDERED	(N)
Tacoma	Washington	P	W	X	10.7	28
Tampa-St. Petersburg	Florida	SA	S	IV	5.3	132
Trenton	New Jersey	MA	E	II	3.6	28
Tulsa	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	7.5	40
Utica-Rome	New York	MA	E	II	3.6	28
*Washington, D.C.	Maryland Virginia	SA	S	III	10.2	225
West Palm Beach	Florida	SA	S	IV	17.6	34
Wichita	Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	4.0	25
Wilkes Barre-Hazelton	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	7.9	38
Worcester	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	2.6	38
York	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	20.0	15
Youngstown-Warren	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	6.3	63
All 106 SMSA's					6.5	9,861
All Other Areas					5.2	8,243
National					5.9	18,104

CENSUS DIVISIONS:
NE New England
MA Middle Atlantic
ENC East North Central
WNC West North Central
SA South Atlantic
ESC East South Central
WSC West South Central
RM (Rocky) Mountain
P Pacific

CENSUS REGIONS: E Northeast NC North Central S South W West

ACTION REGIONS: I through X

*SMSA's with which the report deals in greater detail.

Table 35

CORRELATIONS OF PERCENTAGES OF THOSE WHO CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING AND PERCENTAGES OF ACTIVE VOLUNTEERS AND HOURS SPENT VOLUNTEERING DURING THE YEAR
(106 SMSA's)

	Correlation	Significance*
Percentage of those who considered with percentages of active volunteers	+.175	.036
Percentage of those who considered with average hours per year	-.190	.025

* Significantly different from zero correlation at specified level.

In the 106 identified SMSA's, there were more respondents who had considered volunteering in health, education and politics than there were in other sampling areas of the ACTION study. In turn, these respondents were more prone than their counterparts in the 106 SMSA's to have given some thought to volunteering in religious, social welfare, recreational, citizenship and civic activities (Table 36).

Disaggregation of the overall results in terms of individual SMSA's leaves us, of course, with rather few cases since altogether the number of those who had considered volunteering in the 106 SMSA's is N = 643. In 22 SMSA's, we have at least ten respondents. Some clues to local variation might therefore still be derived.

We find that interest in health organizations varies from 66.7 percent (Columbus, Ohio) to 15.4 percent (Chicago, Illinois). In Cleveland, 40.0 percent (of only ten respondents in the category, however) had considered doing volunteer work in education; in Atlanta, Chicago, Columbus, Dallas, Houston and Milwaukee, not a single respondent mentioned educational organizations.

Religious activities were cited by no respondent in Seattle and St. Louis, but by 37.5 percent in Anaheim and 20.0 percent in Baltimore.

Table 36

TYPES OF ACTIVITY CONTEXTS CONSIDERED BY THOSE WHO THOUGHT THEY MIGHT VOLUNTEER BUT DIDN'T (NATIONAL, IDENTIFIED SMSA'S, OTHER AREAS)

	National (N = 1074)	Identified SMSA'S* (N = 643)	Other Areas (N = 431)
Health related	33.0	36.3	28.1
Education related	7.2	8.7	4.9
Justice system related	0.6	0.6	0.5
Citizenship related	8.0	6.4	10.4
Social welfare related	9.8	8.7	11.4
Recreation related	9.5	8.7	10.7
Civic and community programs related	6.9	6.5	7.4
Religion related	11.4	10.1	13.5
Political system related	3.8	5.1	1.9

*106 SMSA'S.

**Those who indicated other types of contexts than here specified were excluded from the tabulation.

Involvement in activities connected with the justice system was reported as a consideration quite infrequently in all, and among the 22 SMSA's of Table 37 it occurred only in Dallas (6.3 percent), San Diego (5.6 percent) and Detroit (3.4 percent).

Thus the variability among the SMSA's is very high also when we consider only those respondents who thought of volunteering and did not do so. The pattern with which they reported to have contemplated volunteering in one activity or another, in one type of organizational setting or another, is highly localized.

Table 37

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXTS FOR WHICH 1973 - 1974 NON-VOLUNTEERS CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING

	(N)	Health	Education	Justice	Citizenship	Social Welfare	Recreation	Civic	Religion	Politics
Anaheim	(16)	18.8	18.8	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	37.5	12.5
Atlanta	(14)	42.9	0.0	0.0	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1
Baltimore	(10)	30.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
Boston	(16)	25.0	18.8	0.0	6.3	31.3	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
Chicago	(26)	15.4	0.0	0.0	7.7	15.4	15.4	11.5	11.5	7.7
Cleveland	(10)	50.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
Columbus	(12)	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0
Dallas	(16)	50.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	6.3	0.0	12.5	0.0
Detroit	(29)	27.6	13.8	3.4	10.3	6.9	24.1	0.0	13.8	0.0
Houston	(15)	53.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	13.3	0.0
Los Angeles	(38)	23.7	10.5	0.0	7.9	5.3	7.9	13.2	5.3	5.3
Milwaukee	(12)	41.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	8.3	8.3	0.0
Minneapolis	(22)	27.3	4.5	0.0	9.1	22.7	4.5	0.0	13.6	0.0
Nassau	(15)	26.7	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	6.7	13.3	26.7
New York	(20)	40.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Philadelphia	(18)	22.2	16.7	0.0	0.0	5.6	5.6	27.8	5.6	0.0

Table 37 (Continued)
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXTS FOR WHICH 1973 - 1974 NON-VOLUNTEERS CONSIDERED VOLUNTEERING

	(N)	Health	Education	Justice	Citizenship	Social Welfare	Recreation	Civic	Religion	Politics
Sacramento*	(12)	16.7	8.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	25.0	8.3	8.3	0.0
San Francisco	(19)	21.1	10.5	0.0	5.3	15.8	10.5	10.5	5.3	15.8
St. Louis	(13)	38.5	15.4	0.0	7.7	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Diego	(18)	22.2	5.6	5.6	11.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	16.7	0.0
Seattle	(18)	22.2	11.1	0.0	5.6	5.6	11.1	11.1	0.0	5.6
Washington, D.C.	(23)	47.8	13.0	0.0	4.3	4.3	8.7	8.7	4.3	8.7

*Sacramento SMSA which had not been previously included in any tabulation on SMSA details appears here because the number of those who had considered volunteering exceeds the limit within which Table 37 was set up.
All the other SMSA's here are also among the 30 on which we have focused somewhat more fully throughout the analysis.

**Because "other" volunteering was also possible, the percentages do not necessarily add up to 100 percent in each row.

XI. A SIMPLE TRADE-OFF ANALYSIS

Two simple assumptions lead to the results of Table 38. First, we assume that those Americans who did volunteer in the year prior to April, 1974, would continue doing so during the following year as well, unless they reported plans to stop their voluntary activity.

Thus we take statements of the respondents that they might not keep up their volunteering at their face value for this purpose, even though we recognize the various impacts, small as well as large ones, which may propel some of them to continue volunteering anyway; and others, in turn, to cease volunteering even though they had April, 1974 plans to maintain their activity.

Secondly, we assume that those who said that they considered volunteering in 1973-1974 and did not do so will, in fact, become volunteers in the subsequent year. In other words, we are taking their 1973-1974 "consideration" as an indicator of plans for the future which were simply not realized up to the time of the research.

Of course, some of these individuals are not likely to volunteer; however, others who did not even consider volunteering in 1973-1974 might enter the field. Since we cannot estimate these various flows, we assume that they, in effect, balance each other out so that those with volunteering intentions give us a good clue to evaluating numbers of new entrants into volunteering.

Table 38 thus results by discounting those who planned to stop volunteering, and adding those who reported that they did consider voluntary activity during 1973-1974 even though it did not become realized.

The data, under the two assumptions specified, imply a slight increase in national volunteering--a shift from 23.7 to 24.6 percent. This comes about by a larger positive change among volunteers in the 106 SMSA's (from 22.8 to 24.4 percent), counterbalanced by a very small loss of volunteers in the other areas from which the study respondents were drawn.

Table 38

1973-1974 VOLUNTEERING IN 106 SMSA'S AND ESTIMATED VOLUNTEERING FOR 1974-1975

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	Percent 1973-1974	Estimate 1974-1975**	Gain or Loss
Akron	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	31.1	29.5	- 1.6
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	New York	MA	E	II	34.7	33.3	- 1.4
*Anaheim-Santa Anna-Garden Grove	California	P	W	IX	33.0	36.7	+ 3.7
Appleton-Oshkosh	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	25.7	31.4	+ 5.7
*Atlanta	Georgia	SA	S	IV	27.8	32.4	+ 4.6
Austin	Texas	WSC	S	VI	20.0	24.0	+ 4.0
Bakersfield	California	P	W	IX	14.3	16.7	+ 2.4
*Baltimore	Maryland	SA	S	IV	23.1	23.1	--
Baton Rouge	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	38.9	33.3	- 5.6
Beaumont-Port Arthur Orange	Texas	WSC	S	VI	35.7	42.8	+ 7.1
Birmingham	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	20.5	20.5	--
*Boston	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	15.9	17.5	+ 1.6
Bridgeport	Connecticut	NE	E	I	21.5	25.6	+ 4.1
*Buffalo	New York	MA	E	IV	28.7	28.0	- 0.7
Canton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	19.2	25.0	+ 5.8
Charleston	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	21.2	21.2	--
Charlotte	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	29.9	22.1	- 7.8
*Chicago	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	19.0	18.9	- 0.1
*Cleveland	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	17.6	21.2	+ 3.6
Columbia	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	16.7	19.4	+ 2.7

Table 38 (Continued)

1973-1974 VOLUNTEERING IN 106 SMSA'S AND ESTIMATED VOLUNTEERING FOR 1974-1975

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	Percent 1973-1974	Estimate 1974-1975**	Gain or Loss
*Columbus	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	25.6	31.6	+ 6.0
Corpus Christi	Texas	WSC	S	VI	41.7	41.7	--
*Dallas	Texas	WSC	S	VI	23.2	27.3	+ 4.1
Dayton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	27.9	39.3	+11.4
*Denver	Colorado	RM	W	VIII	35.5	33.3	- 2.2
Des Moines	Iowa	WNC	NC	VII	41.7	47.2	+ 5.5
*Detroit	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	23.6	25.5	+ 1.9
El Paso	Texas	WSC	S	VI	37.5	35.0	- 2.5
Erie	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	27.0	24.3	- 2.7
Flint	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	20.3	18.6	- 1.7
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood	Florida	SA	S	IV	21.8	19.5	- 2.3
Fort Wayne	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	27.3	21.2	- 6.1
Fort Worth	Texas	WSC	S	VI	18.9	20.0	+ 1.1
Fresno	California	P	W	IX	17.3	19.8	+ 2.5
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	14.9	13.4	- 1.5
Grand Rapids	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	20.3	26.1	+ 5.8
High Point	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	26.2	27.8	+ 1.6
Greenville	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	13.5	16.2	+ 2.7
Harrisburg	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	25.3	30.6	+ 5.3

Table 38 (Continued)

1973-1974 VOLUNTEERING IN 106 SMSA'S AND ESTIMATED VOLUNTEERING FOR 1974-1975

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	Percent 1973-1974	Estimate 1974-1975**	Gain or Loss
Hartford	Connecticut	NE	E	I	10.8	16.9	+ 6.1
Honolulu	Hawaii	P	W	IX	10.9	13.0	+ 2.1
*Houston	Texas	WSC	S	VI	14.2	18.4	+ 4.2
*Indianapolis	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	39.3	38.5	- 0.8
Jackson	Mississippi	ESC	S	IV	17.6	11.8	- 5.8
Jacksonville	Florida	SA	S	IV	25.5	29.1	+ 3.6
Jersey City	New Jersey	MA	E	II	13.3	8.9	- 4.4
Johnstown	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	31.8	36.4	+ 4.6
*Kansas City	Missouri-Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	28.2	30.9	+ 2.7
Knoxville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	22.2	21.1	- 1.1
Lancaster	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	36.0	26.0	-10.0
Lansing	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	17.3	25.0	+ 7.7
Little Rock-North Little Rock	Arkansas	WSC	S	VI	14.3	12.7	- 1.6
Lorrain-Elyria	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	40.0	44.0	+ 4.0
*Los Angeles-Long Beach	California	P	W	IX	20.9	22.3	+ 1.4
Madison	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	18.4	18.4	--
Miami	Florida	SA	S	IV	8.0	9.6	+ 1.6
*Milwaukee	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	22.1	24.3	+ 2.2
*Minneapolis-St. Paul	Minnesota	WNC	NC	V	32.6	37.7	+ 5.1
Mobile	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	45.8	29.2	-16.6

Table 38 (Continued)

1973-1974 VOLUNTEERING IN 106 SMSA'S AND ESTIMATED VOLUNTEERING FOR 1974-1975

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	Percent 1973-1974	Estimate 1974-1975**	Gain or Loss
Nashville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	17.2	15.6	- 1.6
*Nassau-Suffolk	New York	MA	E	II	17.3	20.1	+ 2.8
New Haven	Connecticut	NE	E	I	23.7	28.6	+ 4.9
New Orleans	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	13.5	16.6	+ 3.1
*New York	New York	MA	E	II	12.2	12.8	+ 0.6
*Newark	New Jersey	MA	E	II	20.3	18.4	- 1.9
Newport News-Hampton	Virginia	SA	S	III	18.2	21.2	+ 3.0
Norfolk-Portsmouth	Virginia	SA	S	III	34.7	29.2	- 5.5
Oklahoma City	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	27.1	28.8	+ 1.7
Orlando	Florida	SA	S	IV	23.1	23.1	--
Oxnard-Ventura	California	P	W	IX	23.7	32.3	+ 8.6
*Patterson-Clifton-Passaic	New Jersey	MA	E	II	24.6	23.8	- 0.8
Peoria	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	34.8	32.6	- 2.2
*Philadelphia	Pennsylvania-New Jersey	MA	E	III	21.4	22.3	+ 0.9
Phoenix	Arizona	RM	W	IX	24.0	30.7	+ 6.7
*Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	28.7	22.1	- 6.6
Reading	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	27.3	24.3	- 3.0
Richmond	Virginia	SA	S	III	33.9	33.9	--
Rochester	New York	MA	E	II	23.7	18.0	- 5.7
Rockford	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	29.2	25.0	- 4.2

Table 38 (Continued)

1973-1974 VOLUNTEERING IN 106 SMSA'S AND ESTIMATED VOLUNTEERING FOR 1974-1975

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	Percent 1973-1974	Estimate 1974-1975**	Gain or Loss
Sacramento	California	P	W	IX	23.7	26.3	+ 2.6
*St. Louis	Missouri-Illinois	WNC	NC	VII	35.0	35.0	--
Salinas-Monterey	California	P	W	IX	21.4	21.4	--
San Antonio	Texas	WSC	S	VI	16.1	21.8	+ 5.7
*San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario	California	P	W	IX	24.8	28.8	+ 4.0
*San Diego	California	P	W	IX	23.7	30.8	+ 7.1
*San Francisco-Oakland	California	P	W	IX	26.1	27.7	+ 1.6
*San Jose	California	P	W	IX	27.5	26.6	- 1.1
Santa Barbara	California	P	W	IX	41.7	44.4	+ 2.7
*Seattle-Everett	Washington	P	W	X	40.1	45.1	+ 5.0
Shreveport	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	13.0	19.6	+ 6.6
South Bend	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	31.3	25.1	- 6.2
Spokane	Washington	P	W	X	21.6	10.8	- 9.8
Stockton	California	P	W	IX	14.6	14.6	--
Syracuse	New York	MA	E	II	27.3	30.9	+ 3.6
Tacoma	Washington	P	W	X	40.4	44.6	+ 4.2
Tampa-St. Petersburg	Florida	SA	S	IV	13.2	16.4	+ 3.2
Trenton	New Jersey	MA	E	II	26.3	26.3	--
Tulsa	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	23.1	27.2	+ 4.1
Utica-Rome	New York	MA	E	II	22.2	22.2	--

Table 38 (Continued)

1973-1974 VOLUNTEERING IN 106 SMSA'S AND ESTIMATED VOLUNTEERING FOR 1974-1975

SMSA		CENSUS DIVISIONS	CENSUS REGIONS	ACTION REGIONS	Percent 1973-1974	Estimate 1974-1975**	Gain or Loss
*Washington, D.C.	Maryland-Virginia	SA	S	III	25.5	31.1	+ 5.6
West Palm Beach	Florida	SA	S	IV	24.4	28.8	+ 4.4
Wichita	Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	21.9	18.7	- 3.2
Wilkes Barre-Hazelton	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	15.6	13.3	- 2.3
Worcester	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	20.8	20.8	--
York	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	31.8	45.4	+13.6
Youngstown-Warren	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	20.3	20.3	--
All 106 SMSA'S					22.8	24.4	+ 1.6
All Other (Unidentified) SMSA'S					24.8	24.7	- 0.1
National					23.7	24.6	+ 0.9

*SMSA's with which the report deals in greater detail.

**The estimate is obtained by subtracting from active volunteers (percent of 1973-1974 volunteers) those who said that they would not continue their activity in the following year, and adding the percentage of non-volunteers who said that they considered volunteering.

Net gains occur in 57 of the 106 SMSA's; they characterize 18 of the 30 SMSA's for which we have been providing more detailed analysis. In York, Pennsylvania, with an estimated gain of 13.6 percent, and in Dayton, Ohio, with an increase by 11.4 percent, the shift is particularly large.

Net losses result in 35 of the 106 SMSA's; and in eight of the 30 which we have repeatedly dealt with: Buffalo, Chicago, Denver, Indianapolis, Newark, Passaic, Pittsburgh and San Jose.

The largest negative change occurs in Mobile, Alabama (-16.6 percent) where 1973-1964 volunteering rate was the highest of all the 106 SMSA's (but the sample size on which the estimates are based is quite small). This comes about due to the relatively low retention rate of reported volunteers (63.6 percent planned to continue volunteering), and zero intentions among non-volunteers.

A 10 percent loss of volunteers is implied by the Lancaster, Pennsylvania results: again, the retention rate is relatively low (72.2 percent), and no respondent had considered volunteering among the non-volunteers of the year.

Finally, there are 14 SMSA's (among the 106) in which the 1973-1974 rate is the same as the estimated future rate. Among the 30 more specially treated SMSA's, Baltimore and St. Louis display this pattern. In both SMSA's, this comes about as a consequence of counterflows: the loss of volunteers due to discontinuation of activity is exactly compensated by the gain in new participants.

Such balancing also leads to no net change in Birmingham, Alabama, Orlando, Florida, Richmond, Virginia, Stockton, California, Utica-Rome, New York, Trenton, New Jersey, Worcester, Massachussets, and Youngstown-Warren, Ohio.

In the remaining SMSA's in which there was no net shift, the outcome results from the fact that all 1973-1974 volunteers intended to continue volunteering, and no non-volunteers had considered becoming one. The pattern describes the data for Charleston, South Carolina, Corpus Christi, Texas, Madison, Wisconsin, and Salinas-Monteray, California.

The simple assumptions which allow us to provide an estimate of volunteering rates beyond the April, 1974 study time then lead to very different results in the various SMSA's (as well as other areas) of the nation.

XII. ONE WEEK'S VOLUNTEERS

Unfortunately, the specefic week of activities about which the volunteers were questioned in the Bureau of the Census/ACTION study was an exceptional one. Passover in 1974 occurred on April 7; Easter fell on April 13. Thus, the week immediately anteceding the data collection for the study was clearly not typical.

But at least for that week, given its somewhat unusual nature, the data revealed volunteering patterns somewhat less subject to problems of recall than do the data for the year as a whole.

Table 39, which summarizes the information for all 106 SMSA's shows that of the year's volunteers, between zero percent (Shreveport, Louisiana but with only 6 respondents to whom the item was applicable) and 85.7 percent (York, Pennsylvania--with only 7 respondents in the appropriate category) had done some voluntary work during the week of April 7 through April 13, 1974.

In the 30 SMSA's on which we have focused more than on others, the variability is not as pronounced but it is sharp nevertheless. In Boston, the volunteer rate was 57.1 percent as it was in Atlanta. In San Jose, with 24.2 percent, it was lower by a factor of 2.4.

Average hours for the week's activities for all the SMSA's vary from no time at all (implicit in the no volunteering in Shreveport) to an unrealistic, though plausible, estimate of almost 70 hours reported by three of the six respondents who did some voluntary work in South Bend, Indiana during this period.

In the larger SMSA's, over 16 hours were invested by the average week's volunteer in Nassau-Suffolk, over 15 hours in Seattle--and more than 37 hours in San Diego. The relatively few volunteers in San Jose (24.2 percent) also reported to have contributed only less than two hours each (1.8 hours on the average).

In Table 10, we had provided data on the frequencies of volunteering in the 30 SMSA's: percentages of those who volunteered once a week, every two weeks, and so on. Average hours spent on each volunteering

Table 39

PERCENTAGES OF VOLUNTEERS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEER DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 THROUGH APRIL 13, 1974

SMSA		Census Divisions	Census Regions	ACTION Regions	Percent Volunteers	Hours Per Volunteer**	(N)***
Akron	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	10.5	7.5	19
Albany-Schnectady-Troy	New York	MA	E	II	53.8	7.2	26
*Anaheim-Santa Anna-Garden Grove	California	P	W	IX	30.6	4.9	62
Appleton-Oshkosh	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	22.2	2.5	9
*Atlanta	Georgia	SA	S	IV	57.1	6.0	49
Austin	Texas	WSC	S	VI	40.0	5.0	5
Bakersfield	California	P	W	IX	16.7	1.0	6
*Baltimore	Maryland	SA	S	IV	44.2	6.8	52
Baton Rouge	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	50.0	12.0	14
Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange	Texas	WSC	S	VI	20.0	4.0	5
Birmingham	Alabama	ESC	S	IV	52.9	5.2	17
*Boston	Massachusetts	NE	E	I	57.1	6.4	49
Bridgeport	Connecticut	NE	E	I	50.0	3.2	14
*Buffalo	New York	MA	E	IV	39.5	4.8	43
Canton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	20.0	5.0	10
Charleston	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	14.3	1.0	7
Charlotte	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	39.1	14.0	23
*Chicago	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	41.4	9.2	145

Table 39 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF VOLUNTEERS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEER DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 THROUGH APRIL 13, 1974

SMSA		Census Divisions	Census Regions	ACTION Regions	Percent Volunteers	Hours Per Volunteers**	(N)***
*Cleveland	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	32.4	10.2	34
Columbia	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	58.3	2.3	12
*Columbus	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	46.7	5.8	30
Corpus Christi	Texas	WSC	S	VI	40.0	5.2	10
*Dallas	Texas	WSC	S	VI	49.0	9.5	51
Dayton	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	64.7	5.4	17
*Denver	Colorado	RM	W	VIII	51.0	14.0	49
Des Moines	Iowa	WNC	NC	VII	40.0	1.8	15
*Detroit	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	32.4	5.0	102
El Paso	Texas	WSC	S	VI	40.0	9.0	15
Erie	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	20.0	6.0	10
Flint	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	33.3	2.5	12
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood	Florida	SA	S	IV	63.2	4.7	19
Fort Wayne	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	11.1	6.0	9
Fort Worth	Texas	WSC	S	VI	41.2	14.2	17
Fresno	California	P	W	IX	35.7	4.5	14
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	40.0	2.0	10
Grand Rapids	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	57.1	16.8	14
High Point	North Carolina	SA	S	IV	42.8	2.3	21

Table 39 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF VOLUNTEERS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEER DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 THROUGH APRIL 13, 1974

SMSA		Census Divisions	Census Regions	ACTION Regions	Percent Volunteers	Hours Per Volunteer**	(N)***
Greenville	South Carolina	SA	S	IV	20.0	3.0	5
Harrisburg	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	52.6	3.9	19
Hartford	Connecticut	NE	E	I	42.8	9.5	7
Honolulu	Hawaii	P	W	IX	50.0	4.0	6
*Houston	Texas	WSC	S	VI	40.5	14.2	37
*Indianapolis	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	35.8	6.5	53
Jackson	Mississippi	ESC	S	IV	16.7	5.0	6
Jacksonville	Florida	SA	S	IV	57.1	4.7	14
Jersey City	New Jersey	MA	E	II	33.3	13.0	6
Johnstown	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	14.3	2.0	7
*Kansas City	Missouri-Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	40.5	5.3	42
Knoxville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	30.0	10.0	20
Lancaster	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	44.4	6.9	18
Lansing	Michigan	ENC	NC	V	33.3	3.0	9
Little Rock-North Little Rock	Arkansas	WSC	S	VI	12.5	3.0	8
Lorain-Elyria	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	45.0	7.8	20
*Los Angeles-Long Beach	California	P	W	IX	47.6	7.6	168
Madison	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	V	85.7	9.5	7
Miami	Florida	SA	S	IV	50.0	8.8	14

Table 39 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF VOLUNTEERS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEER DURING
THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 THROUGH APRIL 13, 1974

SMSA		Census Divisions	Census Regions	ACTION Regions	Percent Volunteers	Hours Per Volunteer**	(N)***
*Milwaukee	Wisconsin	ENC	NC	IV	47.5	5.5	40
*Minneapolis-St. Paul	Minnesota	WNC	NC	V	40.8	9.4	76
Mobile	Alabama	ESC	S	V	36.4	1.0	11
Nashville	Tennessee	ESC	S	IV	27.3	4.0	11
Nassau-Suffolk	New York	MA	E	II	41.9	16.2	43
New Haven	Connecticut	NE	E	I	44.4	8.0	9
New Orleans	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	53.8	9.2	13
*New York	New York	MA	E	II	44.2	10.8	113
*Newark	New Jersey	MA	E	II	36.4	5.2	44
Newport News-Hampton	Virginia	SA	S	III	33.3	10.0	6
Norfolk-Portsmouth	Virginia	SA	S	III	16.0	2.5	25
Oklahoma City	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	25.0	3.0	16
Orlando	Florida	SA	S	IV	33.3	6.8	12
Oxnard-Ventura	California	P	W	IX	55.6	12.8	9
Patterson-Clifton-Passaic	New Jersey	MA	E	II	51.6	8.5	31
Peoria	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	43.8	10.0	16
*Philadelphia	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	43.1	7.0	123
Phoenix	Arizona	RM	W	IX	28.0	6.4	25
*Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	39.2	5.9	74
Reading	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	11.1	4.0	9

Table 39 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF VOLUNTEERS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEER DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 THROUGH APRIL 13, 1974

SMSA		Census Divisions	Census Regions	ACTION Regions	Percent Volunteers	Hours Per Volunteer**	(N)***
Richmond	Virginia	SA	S	III	55.0	10.5	20
Rochester	New York	MA	E	II	43.5	4.5	23
Rockford	Illinois	ENC	NC	V	14.3	9.0	14
Sacramento	California	P	W	IX	29.6	5.4	27
*St. Louis	Missouri-Illinois	WNC	NC	VII	46.9	7.5	96
Salinas-Monterey	California	P	W	IX	66.7	26.0	3
San Antonio	Texas	WSC	S	VI	14.3	n.a.	14
*San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario	California	P	W	IX	51.4	12.4	37
*San Diego	California	P	W	IX	30.0	37.2	40
*San Francisco-Oakland	California	P	W	IX	39.8	9.5	83
*San Jose	California	P	W	IX	24.2	1.8	33
Santa Barbara	California	P	W	IX	53.3	8.8	15
*Seattle-Everett	Washington	P	W	X	30.8	15.2	15
Shreveport	Louisiana	WSC	S	VI	0.0	0.0	6
South Bend	Indiana	ENC	NC	V	60.0	69.7	10
Spokane	Washington	P	W	X	50.0	18.8	8
Stockton	California	P	W	IX	16.7	3.0	6
Syracuse	New York	MA	E	II	33.3	9.8	15
Tacoma	Washington	P	W	X	36.8	8.6	19

Table 39 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF VOLUNTEERS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEER DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 THROUGH APRIL 13, 1974

SMSA		Census Divisions	Census Regions	ACTION Regions	Percent Volunteers	Hours Per Volunteer**	(N)***
Tampa-St. Petersburg	Florida	SA	S	IV	35.0	4.2	20
Trenton	New Jersey	MA	E	II	20.0	4.5	10
Tulsa	Oklahoma	WSC	S	VI	8.3	7.0	12
Utica-Rome	New York	MA	E	II	12.5	3.0	8
*Washington, D.C.	Maryland-Virginia	SA	S	III	37.7	4.5	77
West Palm Beach	Florida	SA	S	IV	63.6	3.3	11
Wichita	Kansas	WNC	NC	VII	42.8	16.7	7
Wilkes Barre-Hazelton	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	14.3	13.0	7
Worcester	Massachsutts	NE	E	I	30.0	4.7	10
York	Pennsylvania	MA	E	III	85.7	4.0	7
Youngstown-Warren	Ohio	ENC	NC	V	50.0	6.8	16
All 106 SMSA's					40.6	8.4	2907**
All Other (Unidentified) SMSA's					42.9	8.1	2720**
National					41.7	8.2	5627**

* SMSA's with which the report deals in greater detail.

** Estimates of average hours are not based on all last week's volunteers. Data were available for 1999 of the 2349 national "last week's" volunteers, 1008 of the 1168 in other than identified (106) SMSA's, and 991 of the 1181 respondents in the identified SMSA's. Averages of those who responded were used for the remaining interviewees.

*** Number of volunteers during the week.

Table 39 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF VOLUNTEERS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER VOLUNTEER DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 THROUGH APRIL 13, 1974

CENSUS DIVISIONS:	NE	New England	WNC	West North Central	WSC	West South Central
	MA	Middle Atlantic	SA	South Atlantic	RM	(Rocky) Mountain
	ENC	East North Central	ENC	East South Central	P	Pacific

CENSUS REGIONS:	E	Northeast	NC	North Central	S	South	W	West

ACTION REGIONS: I through X

occasion, itself imputed from annual hours and from frequencies of volunteering, were given in Table 11. In the subsequent tabulation, Table 40, we have calculated what volunteering rate would have been in the week of April 7 through April 13 had it been a "typical" week; or else, if the annual data on volunteering frequencies provide a good estimate on which to base an assessment of weekly volunteering rates. We have also included, for comparative purposes, average time investment per volunteering occasion so that it may be contrasted with the averages reported by the April 7 through April 13, 1974 volunteers.

The results are quite interesting and, within the framework of our premises, quite revealing. Many more volunteers would have been expected to be active in the week of April 7 through April 13 than actually were. Thus it seems that the particular character of the week in question, is deeply religious in meaning and may have diverted good numbers of "usual" volunteers into other, possibly devotional, activities. The associated school recess may have, on the other hand, provided opportunities (as well as obligations) to be with one's family; to become involved in recreational activities; to travel. The data do not well tell the story and we can only speculate. But such interpretations are, at least, plausible.

Even so, three of the 30 SMSA's are an exception to the overall pattern: in Atlanta, there were actually more volunteers in the week of April 7 through April 13 than would have been predicted by our simple estimation model; in Buffalo and Denver, the numbers of actual volunteers turned out to be just what would have been expected for "a typical week".

Furthermore, in a couple of SMSA's the difference between actual and projected percentages is quite small: in Columbus, the estimated volunteering rate exceeds the actualized one by only 3.3 percent; in Milwaukee, by 5.0 percent.

If the week of April 7 through April 13, 1974 seems to have produced fewer volunteers than would have been predicted, it is also clear that these fewer volunteers spent more time than volunteers tend to do on an "average occasion". It is, in fact, almost as if they had compensated for the slack in volunteering numbers by becoming more generous with their time on this particular occasion. San Jose is the sole exception: actually fewer average hours were spent than on an "average" volunteering occasion typical of San Jose participants.

Table 40

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN APRIL WEEK OF 1974 AND ESTIMATES OF RATES AND HOURS FOR A TYPICAL WEEK BASED ON IMPLICATIONS OF THE FULL YEAR'S DATA

	Percent Volunteers	Estimated Percent*	Hours Per Volunteer	Hours Per Occasion**
Anaheim	30.6	48.4	4.9	2.9
Atlanta	57.1	49.0	6.0	3.2
Baltimore	44.2	53.8	6.8	3.7
Boston	57.1	65.3	6.4	2.7
Buffalo	39.5	39.5	4.8	3.5
Chicago	41.4	64.8	9.2	2.6
Cleveland	32.4	58.8	10.2	2.8
Columbus	46.7	50.0	5.8	2.5
Dallas	49.0	72.5	9.5	3.8
Denver	51.0	51.0	14.0	2.1
Detroit	32.4	45.0	5.0	3.2
Houston	40.5	59.4	14.2	2.3
Indianapolis	35.8	56.6	6.5	2.2
Kansas City	40.5	54.8	5.3	3.2
Los Angeles	47.6	66.7	7.6	3.6
Milwaukee	47.5	52.5	5.5	2.7
Minneapolis	40.8	53.9	9.4	3.3
Nassau	41.9	58.1	16.2	2.6

Table 40 (Continued)

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN APRIL WEEK OF 1974 AND ESTIMATES OF RATES AN HOURS FOR A TYPICAL WEEK BASED ON IMPLICATIONS OF THE FULL YEAR'S DATA

	Percent Volunteers	Estimated Percent*	Hours Per Volunteer	Hours Per Occasion**
New York	44.2	70.8	10.8	3.6
Newark	36.4	56.8	5.2	3.8
Passaic	51.6	77.4	8.5	3.4
Philadelphia	43.1	56.9	7.0	3.7
Pittsburgh	39.2	64.8	5.9	2.8
St. Louis	46.9	56.2	7.5	3.9
San Bernardino	51.4	64.9	12.4	3.8
San Diego	30.0	55.0	37.2	3.4
San Francisco	39.8	61.4	9.5	3.8
San Jose	24.2	51.5	1.8	2.9
Seattle	30.8	55.6	15.2	3.3
Washington, D.C.	37.7	64.9	4.5	3.6
All 106 SMSA's	40.6	58.1	8.4	3.2
Other Areas	42.9	51.4	8.1	2.9
National	41.7	54.8	8.2	3.1

* Frequency-of-volunteering distribution of Table 10 was applied here to calculate what "typical volunteering" rate would be per week. It is simply obtained by summing numbers of "typical week's" volunteers which would result if the probabilities of Table 10 hold, the total number of volunteers for the year is as given, and appropriate weights are applied to the probabilities.

Table 40 (Continued)

VOLUNTEERING RATES AND HOURS IN APRIL WEEK OF 1974 AND ESTIMATES OF RATES AND HOURS FOR A TYPICAL WEEK BASED ON IMPLICATIONS OF THE FULL YEAR'S DATA

Thus,

$$p_e = \frac{\Sigma\, N_v\, p_i\, w_i}{N_v}$$

where p_e is the proportion estimated in Table 40 (here presented as a percentage, of course),

N_v is the number of volunteers during 1973-1974 in the referent SMSA (or other unit considered),

p_i stands for proportions of respondents who reported particular annual frequencies of volunteering (Table 10), and the subscript,

i takes the value of "other" = "more than once a week", "once a week", "once every two weeks", "once every month", "a few times" = about "four times in the year", and "only once".

w_i is the weight applied to the p_i's to express the results in per week units.

When p_i for "more than once a week" or "once a week" is taken, $w_i = 1$ on the assumption that all weekly and more-than-weekly volunteers would have also volunteered between April 7 and 13.

For "once every two weeks", $w_i = \frac{1}{2}$.

When the proportion, p_i, of those who volunteered "once a month" is taken, $w_i = 1/4.33 = 52/12 =$ number of weeks/number of months.

With p_i standing for those who volunteered "a few times", assumed to be about four annual occasions, $w_i = 1/13 = 52/4$.

Finally, for those who volunteered only once, $w_i = 1/52$.

** Hours per occasion are taken here from Table 11. Implicit in the resulting comparison is that the April 7 through 13 volunteers, for the most part, were active on only one occasion.

We can safely assume that the higher hourly averages may imply more volunteering events during the week than merely one. This is "safe" to say in light of some of the high hourly averages which are not interpretable unless we are willing to assume a number of instances of volunteering during the week. This conclusion is in keeping with the sense of the data: during the week in question, there was more free time available; some volunteers became more frequently active as volunteers; others were actually prone to do less volunteering during the week and, we suspect, became more engrossed in the affairs of the family (with school out to give an extended weekend) and, possibly, in religious activities of devotional character.

XIII. ONE WEEK'S ACTIVITIES

During the April, 1974 week under specific inquiry in the Bureau of the Census study, religious activities were the dominant ones.

In the nation as a whole, just about 50 percent of the week's volunteers were active in efforts related to religious organizations: fewer in the 106 SMSA's (42.8 percent) than in other sampling areas (57.1 percent).

Even though the subsamples for the 30 major SMSA's are rather small, the high variability (Table 41) is unlikely accounted for by sampling fluctuations alone. There were, for instance, no religious volunteers in San Jose (with N only of 8 respondents--the indivuduals who had done voluntary work of any kind during the week). There were but 11.1 percent religious volunteers in Nassau (N = 18), 9.1 percent in Cleveland (N = 11), and 15.8 percent in Anaheim (N = 19). On the other hand, there were 64.5 percent of religious volunteers in Minneapolis St. Paul (with N = 31), 63.2 percent in Milwaukee (N = 19), 58.8 percent in Kansas City (N = 17), and 58.6 percent in Pittsburgh (with N = 29).

If religious volunteering was more likely, during the April week, in non-SMSA areas (or at least in SMSA's not explicitly identified by the Bureau of the Census under the data confidentiality provisions) than in the 106 SMSA's, other voluntary work among the major activities was somewhat more probable in the SMSA's than elsewhere: health, education, citizenship, recreation and social welfare related activities.

In Anaheim (with low religious volunteering), the participants were involved most in educational and citizenship related organizations; in Baltimore, religious activities occupied only a few more volunteers than did educational and recreational ones; while in Boston, just about as many people were active in education as were in religion. In Buffalo, citizenship groups and recreational orgnaizations attracted nearly as many volunteers as did religious organizations--while in Columbus, religious and citizenship volunteering was reported by the same numbers of "last week's" participants. In the Cleveland SMSA's, with very low (9.1 percent) religious volunteering, citizenship groups seemed most important (and recreational activities came next).

Involvement in citizenship activitiec, and to an extent in health and education was also of particular significance in Nassau, whereas recreation was more important than religious volunteering in Newark. In the San Jose area, the volunteers preferred educational and health related concerns--none having reported religious work during the week. Citizenship organizations proved as much of a magnet for the volunteers as did religious organizations in Seattle and, to some extent, in Washington, D.C.

The more people there are who have done only religious volunteering (Table 14), the higher tended to be religious volunteering during the April week. The correlation coefficient, rho = .402 (rank-ordered data of Table 14 with column one of Table 41), is relatively high.

In Table 37, data were given on unactualized intentions of those who had considered volunteering. A comparison of the results with those of Table 41 shows that religious volunteering, among prospective participants, would have a lower priority than it did have during the week under study in actual patterns of activities. In turn, volunteerism in health organizations would generally exceed the rates revealed for this particular week of April, 1974.

If we use the intentions (as in Table 37) as realistic estimates of activity types in which the prospective volunteers would engage, and if they, in fact, did engage in them, and if we also view the data of Table 41 as estimators of the distribution of volunteers by activity types, the data of Table 42 result. With only several exceptions, considering health and religious volunteering only (the two major activities on the part of both active and potential volunteers), there would be somewhat less religious and somewhat more health volunteering in these SMSA's than had been reported for the April week of the research.

The Anaheim and Nassau results alone imply actually somewhat more religious voluntarism, and less participation in health organizations, than actually did occur (during the week). In Cleveland, there would

Table 41

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF THOSE WHO VOLUNTEERED DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 - 13, 1974

	(N)	Religion	Health	Education	Citizen-ship	Recrea-tion	Social Welfare
Anaheim	(19)	15.8	21.1	26.3	26.3	21.1	10.5
Atlanta	(28)	39.3	17.9	7.1	7.1	28.6	10.7
Baltimore	(23)	30.4	8.7	26.1	17.4	26.1	4.3
Boston	(28)	39.3	14.3	35.7	3.6	10.7	10.7
Buffalo	(17)	29.4	17.6	0.0	23.5	23.5	11.8
Chicago	(60)	31.7	11.7	15.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Cleveland	(11)	9.1	18.2	45.5	18.2	27.3	9.1
Columbus	(14)	42.9	28.6	7.1	42.9	28.6	0.0
Dallas	(25)	52.0	20.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	8.0
Denver	(25)	40.0	16.0	24.0	12.0	4.0	8.0
Detroit	(33)	48.5	21.2	18.2	6.1	6.1	3.0
Houston	(15)	46.7	13.3	20.0	6.7	33.3	0.0
Indianapolis	(19)	31.6	15.8	5.3	15.7	21.1	10.5
Kansas City	(17)	58.8	11.8	11.8	29.4	0.0	0.0
Los Angeles	(80)	46.2	16.2	18.8	12.5	11.2	33.3
Milwaukee	(19)	63.2	5.3	15.8	15.8	10.5	5.3
Minneapolis	(31)	64.5	32.3	9.7	12.9	12.9	16.1
Nassau	(18)	11.1	27.8	22.2	44.4	11.1	5.6
New York	(50)	30.0	12.0	18.0	10.0	12.0	8.0
Newark	(16)	31.3	18.8	6.3	12.5	37.5	0.0

Table 41 (Continued)

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF THOSE WHO VOLUNTEERED DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7 - 13, 1974

	(N)	Religion	Health	Education	Citizenship	Recreation	Social Welfare
Passaic	(16)	37.5	12.5	6.3	25.0	18.8	6.3
Philadelphia	(53)	28.3	15.1	9.4	18.9	11.3	9.4
Pittsburgh	(29)	58.6	20.7	10.3	13.8	6.9	10.3
St. Louis	(45)	44.4	15.6	24.4	24.4	13.3	13.3
San Bernardino	(19)	31.6	26.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	0.0
San Diego	(12)	58.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	8.3	8.3
San Francisco	(33)	45.5	12.1	3.0	12.1	18.2	3.0
San Jose	(8)	0.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	12.5	0.0
Seattle	(20)	55.0	20.0	10.0	50.0	10.0	5.0
Washington, D.C	(29)	48.3	13.8	13.8	34.5	6.9	6.9
All SMSA's	(1181)	42.8	16.3	15.4	14.8	13.3	7.5
Other areas	(1168)	57.1	13.3	14.4	10.2	8.4	7.0
National	(2349)	49.9	14.8	14.9	12.5	10.9	7.4

Table 42

ESTIMATES OF RELIGIOUS AND HEALTH-RELATED VOLUNTEERING BASED ON INTENTIONS (TABLE 37) AND ON ACTUAL ACTIVITIES BETWEEN APRIL 7 - 13, 1974

	Health	Religion
Anaheim	20.0	25.7
Atlanta	26.2	28.6
Baltimore	15.1	27.2
Boston	18.1	27.3
Chicago	12.8	25.6
Cleveland	33.3	9.5
Columbus	46.2	26.9
Dallas	31.7	36.6
Detroit	24.1	32.3
Houston	33.3	30.0
Los Angeles	18.6	33.0
Milwaukee	19.4	41.9
Minneapolis	30.2	43.4
Nassau	27.3	12.1
New York	20.0	24.3
Philadelphia	16.9	22.5
St. Louis	20.7	34.4
San Francisco	15.7	30.8
San Diego	13.3	33.3
Seattle	21.0	28.9
Washington, D.C.	28.8	28.8
All SMSA's	23.3	31.3
Other areas	17.3	45.3
National	20.5	37.8

The estimates combine, for each of the two major activities, those who expressed particular intentions (Table 37) even though they did not actualize them during 1973-1974 and those who were involved in a given activity during the week of April 7 through 13.

SMSA's not reported in Table 37 because of very small numbers of potential volunteers are also not included in this tabulation.

seem to be more volunteering both in religion and health under these conditions, while in Minneapolis and Philadelphia, both of these major activities would receive less than the April week share of volunteering.

If intentions of potential volunteers were actualized and if organizational involvements of those already active were what they had been reported for the April, 1974 week, the Minneapolis data involve an increase in volunteering for social welfare organizations, and the Philadelphia results suggest that civic and community activities would stand to benefit.

Such estimations, of course, are rather tenuous simply because it cannot be assumed that the particular week on which the Bureau of Census focussed during its ACTION study, as a component of its monthly Current Population Survey, was indeed a "typical" week. The important religious holidays of the period in 1974 make such an assumption implausible.

XIV. SOME MAJOR CONFIGURATIONS

High variability among the nation's SMSA's was discovered with respect to each of the variables under study. Some of the results were reported for each of the 106 identified SMSA's: the annual rates and hours of volunteering, plans to continue volunteering, percentages of those who had considered doing voluntary work during the year but did not do so, percentages and volunteering hours involved in the April week of 1974 which preceded the Bureau of the Census field work on the project.

For 30 large SMSA's, many more aspects of volunteering were reported. These SMSA's were included in a more detailed analysis because the numbers of respondents were not so small as to preclude even a crude estimation of the underlying patterns. All in all, some 90 variables, each characterizing a specific dimension of volunteering, were taken into account. Table 43 provides a complete listing of these variables along with national (not SMSA only) averages.

An effort to give an overall perspective on the massive body of information may take various forms. We have chosen to focus on annual volunteering rates (percentages of 1973-1974 volunteers) and annual average hours per volunteer as central to our attempt to tease out the major undercurrents. This attention to rates and annual hours has both theoretical and pragmatic justification. For one, all other actions of the volunteers during the year are nested in the fact that they were volunteers, and that they invested some time, during the year, in these activities. Given the variable volunteering rates and highly variable average hours per volunteer, are there more systematic differences in terms of the more specific volunteering behavior variables? The more pragmatic justification for the choice of core variables is simple enough: to the extent to which volunteering is desirable, as we certainly consider it to be, then it is of particular interest to ACTION as well as to community coordinators of voluntary activities to see to it that the numbers of volunteers

Table 43

VARIABLES EXPLICITLY CONSIDERED IN THE REPORT AND NATIONAL AVERAGES ON THESE VARIABLES

		National Average
1.	Volunteering rate (percent volunteers 1973-1974)	23.7
2.	Annual hours per volunteer	108.0
3.	Annual frequency of volunteering	34.9
4.	Average hours per volunteering event	3.1
5.	Percentage of regular volunteers	56.2
6.	Hours spent by occasional volunteers	34.2
7.	Frequency of volunteering by occasional volunteers	6.1
8.	Hours per volunteering event by occasional volunteers	5.6
9.	Hours spent by regular volunteers	166.0
10.	Frequency of volunteering by regular volunteers	57.0
11.	Hours per volunteering event by regular volunteers	2.9
12.	Percentage of religious-only volunteers	17.4
13.	Hours spent by religious-only volunteers	92.4
14.	Frequency of volunteering by religious-only volunteers	34.7
15.	Hours per volunteering event by religious-only volunteers	2.7
16.	Hours spent by other than religious-only volunteers	111.3
17.	Frequency of volunteering by other than religious-only volunteers	34.9
18.	Hours per volunteering event by other than religious-only volunteers	3.2

Table 43 (Continued)

VARIABLES EXPLICITLY CONSIDERED IN THE REPORT AND NATIONAL AVERAGES ON THESE VARIABLES

		National Average
19.	Percentage of those who initially volunteered before 1950	12.3
20.	Percentage of those who became volunteers between 1950 and 1959	12.7
21.	Percentage of those who became volunteers between 1960 and 1964	11.8
22.	Percentage of those who became volunteers between 1965 and 1969	15.8
23.	Percentage of volunteers who entered the field in 1970 and later	45.9
24.	Annual hours of pre-1960 volunteers	143.8
25.	Frequency of volunteering of pre-1960 volunteers	35.9
26.	Hours per volunteering event of pre-1960 volunteers	4.0
27.	Annual hours of 1960-1969 volunteers	119.3
28.	Frequency of volunteering among the 1960-1969 volunteers	36.3
29.	Hours per volunteering event on the part of 1960-1969 entrants	3.3
30.	Annual hours of 1970 and more recent volunteer entrants	90.5
31.	Frequency of volunteering among the recent volunteers (1970 and after)	33.1
32.	Hours per volunteering event among the recent volunteers (1970 and after)	2.7
33.	Percentage of those who became initially volunteers to "help others"	53.3
34.	Percentage of those who became initially volunteers out of a "sense of duty"	32.1

Table 43 (Continued)

VARIABLES EXPLICITLY CONSIDERED IN THE REPORT AND NATIONAL AVERAGES ON THESE VARIABLES

		National Average
35.	Percentage of those who became initially volunteers because they "couldn't refuse"	14.7
36.	Percentage of those who became initially volunteers because they "had a child in the program"	22.5
37.	Percentage of those who became initially volunteers because "they had nothing else to do"	3.8
38.	Percentage of those who became initially volunteers because of "enjoyment" of the activities	36.2
39.	Percentage of those who became initially volunteers because they hoped that their effort will lead to a "paying job"	2.6
40.	Percentage of those who became initially volunteers for reasons other than those made explicit in variables 33 through 39 above	7.1
41.	Annual hours spent by those who initially became volunteers "to help others"	123.5
42.	Annual hours spent by those who initially volunteered "out of a sense of duty" or because "they couldn't refuse when asked"	109.9
43.	Annual hours spent by those who initially became volunteers because they "enjoyed" the prospects of the activity involved	139.4
44.	Annual hours spent by those who initially became volunteers because their child(ren) was (were) in the program	118.1
45.	Frequency of volunteering of those who initially sought "to help others"	36.5
46.	Frequency of volunteering of those who entered the field "out of a sense of duty" or because they "couldn't refuse"	32.3
47.	Frequency of volunteering of those who became volunteers due to "enjoyment"	41.2

Table 43 (Continued)

VARIABLES EXPLICITLY CONSIDERED IN THE REPORT AND NATIONAL AVERAGES ON THESE VARIABLES

		National Average
48.	Frequency of volunteering of those who became volunteers because they "had a child in the program"	37.7
49.	Hours per volunteering event by those who became volunteers "to help others"	3.4
50.	Hours per volunteering event by those who became volunteers out of "a sense of duty" or because they "couldn't refuse"	3.4
51.	Hours per volunteering event by those who became volunteers because of "enjoyment" of the activities	3.4
52.	Hours per volunteering event by those who became volunteers because they "had a child in the program"	3.1
53.	Percentage of 1973-1974 volunteers who planned to continue volunteering	84.5
54.	Percentage of volunteers with continuation plans who gave their desire to "help others" as reason to continue	59.4
55.	Percentage of volunteers with continuation plans who gave their "sense of duty" as a key reason to continue	38.0
56.	Percentage of volunteers with continuation plans who gave as their main reason to continue their inability "to refuse"	11.3
57.	Percentage of volunteers with continuation plans who intended to continue because they "had a child in the program"	16.6
58.	Percentage of volunteers who planned to continue and gave "enjoyment" as one of their main reasons	48.9
59.	Percentage of volunteers with continuation plans who said that they would continue because "they had nothing else to do"	2.3
60.	Percentage of volunteers with continuation plans who were seeking a "paying job" and gave this as a key reason to continue	2.4

Table 43 (Continued)

VARIABLES EXPLICITLY CONSIDERED IN THE REPORT AND NATIONAL AVERAGES ON THESE VARIABLES

		National Average
61.	Percentage of volunteers who planned to continue and gave "other" than the reasons specified here as variables 54 through 60 as a factor in continuing	6.0
62.	Annual hours of volunteers with continuation plans who gave their desire "to help others" as a reason to to continue	128.7
63.	Annual hours of volunteers with continuation plans who gave their "sense of duty" or inability to "refuse" as a reason to continue	120.8
64.	Annual hours of volunteers with continuation plans who gave "enjoyment" as a reason to continue	138.0
65.	Annual hours of volunteers with continuation plans who gave "having a child in the program" as a reason to continue	121.2
66.	Frequency of volunteering among continued volunteers who gave their desire "to help others" as a reason to continue	37.4
67.	Frequency of volunteering on the part of volunteers with continuation plans who gave their "sense of duty" or inability to "refuse" as a reason to continue	35.4
68.	Frequency of volunteering on the part of volunteers with continuation plans for whom "enjoyment" was a key factor in intentions to continue	40.6
69.	Frequency of volunteering on the part of volunteers with continuation plans who indicated that "having a child in the program" was a reason to continue	38.7
70.	Hours per volunteering event for those with continuation plans who gave their desire "to help others" as a reason to continue	3.4
71.	Hours per volunteering event for those with continuation plans who planned to continue out of "a sense of duty" or because they "couldn't refuse"	3.4

Table 43 (Continued)

VARIABLES EXPLICITLY CONSIDERED IN THE REPORT AND NATIONAL AVERAGES ON THESE VARIABLES

		National Average
72.	Hours per volunteering event for those who planned to continue and gave "enjoyment" as a reason for continuation	3.4
73.	Hours per volunteering event for those with continuation plans who gave "having a child in the program" as a reason to continue	3.1
74.	Percentage of those who considered volunteering but did not	5.2
75.	Percentage of respondents who considered volunteering in religious activities but did not among those who considered at all	11.4
76.	Percentage of respondents who considered volunteering in health-related organizations but did not among those who considered at all	33.0
77.	Percentage of respondents who considered volunteering in educational ogranizations but did not among those who considered at all	7.2
78.	Percentage of respondents who considered citizenship activities but did not actually volunteer among those who considered at all	8.0
79.	Percentage of respondents who considered volunteering in recreation but did not among those who considered at all	9.5
80.	Percentage of respondents, among those who considered at all, who thought to do volunteering in social welfare organizations	9.8
81.	Percentage of respondents, among those who considered at all, who thought to volunteer in justice related activities	0.6
82.	Percentage of respondents, among those who considered at all, who thought to volunteer in civic and community undertakings	6.9

Table 43 (Continued)

VARIABLES EXPLICITLY CONSIDERED IN THE REPORT AND NATIONAL AVERAGES ON THESE VARIABLES

		National Average
83.	Percentage of respondents, among those who considered at all, who thought to volunteer in political activities	3.8
84.	Percentage of the year's volunteers who did voluntary work during the week of April 7 through April 13, 1974	41.7
85.	Average hours spent during the week of April 7 through April 13, 1974 by those who volunteered in this period	8.2
86.	Among the week's volunteers, the percentage of those who reported having done religious work	49.9
87.	The percentage of the week's volunteers who were active in health related organizations	14.8
88.	The percentage of the week's volunteers who were active in education	14.9
89.	The percentage of the week's volunteers who were active in citizenship groups and organizations	12.5
90.	The percentage of the week's volunteers who were involved in recreation-related activities	10.9
91.	The percentage of the week's volunteers who were active in social welfare	7.4

increase, and that, whatever the numbers may be, the time spent volunteering is also increased or, at least, made commesurate to the community needs for participation. What then can be said about more specific volunteering behavior in the nation's SMSA's given their variable rate of involvement and variable time investment per volunteer? The detailed configurational analysis, the results of which are reported here, was based on data for the 30 SMSA's.

First, volunteering pattern data were developed. We used the national averages (Table 43 is the summary) as a benchmark. Each of the SMSA's was characterized as being above or below (and occasionally, at) the national average on each of the variables. Second, we ordered the 30 SMSA's by volunteering rates, from highest to lowest.

Third, we asked: given the variability in volunteering rates, are there systematic differences along the other volunteering variables (dichotomized now in terms of the national standard) which would be associated with this variability? Fourth, we ranked the SMSA's by annual volunteering hours.

Fifth, we asked: given the variability in annual volunteering hours, are there systematic differences along other volunteering variables, dichotomized, which would be associated with this variability?

Sixth, we used the average rank by rates and hours to create an ordering of the SMSA's on both rates and hours.

Seventh, we asked: given the distribution of the 30 SMSA's from highest to lowest both in terms of rates and hours (considered simultaneously), are there systematic differences along other volunteering variables which would be associated with the location of the SMSA's on this simultaneous rates-and-hours ordering?

It follows, therefore, that we must now briefly consider volunteering rates first; that we will then deal with volunteering hours; and, finally, with configuration resulting when both rates and hours are taken into account.

For ease of reference, the rankings of the 30 SMSA's under analysis are given in Table 44. In discussing the volunteering patterns in terms of rates, hours and both rates, we shall be referring to the ordering of these SMSA's in this particular tabulation.

Table 44

RANKING OF 30 LARGE SMSA'S ON VOLUNTEERING RATES, HOURS AND BOTH RATES AND HOURS
(From High To Low)

Rates 1973-1974		Hours 1973-1974		Rates and Hours	
1.	Seattle	1.	Passaic	1.	St. Louis
2.	Indianapolis	2.	New York	2.	San Francisco
3.	Denver	3.	San Francisco	3.	Seattle
4.	St. Louis	4.	Los Angeles	4.	Passaic
5.	Anaheim	5.	Dallas	5.	Minneapolis
6.	Minneapolis	6.	San Bernardino	6.5	Kansas City
7.5	Pittsburgh	7.	Washington, D.C.	6.5	San Bernardino
7.5	Buffalo	8.	St. Louis	8.	Washington, D.C.
9.	Kansas City	9.	Philadelphia	9.	Buffalo
10.	Atlanta	10.	Newark	10.	Dallas
11.	San Jose	11.	San Diego	11.	Pittsburgh
12.	San Francisco	12.	Baltimore	12.	Indiannapolis
13.	Columbus	13.	Minneapolis	13.	Atlanta
14.	Washington, D.C.	14.	Boston	14.	San Diego
15.	San Bernardino	15.	Seattle	15.	Los Angeles
16.	Passaic	16.	Pittsburgh	16.	Philadelphia
17.	San Diego	17.	Atlanta	18.	New York
18.	Detroit	18.	Cleveland	18.	Baltimore
19.	Dallas	19.	Chicago	18.	Denver
20.	Baltimore	20.	Nassau	20.	Anaheim
21.	Milwaukee	21.	Kansas City	21.	Newark
22.	Philadelphia	22.	Indianapolis	22.	San Jose
23.	Los Angeles	23.	Houston	23.	Boston
24.	Newark	24.	Detroit	24.	Detroit
25.	Chicago	25.	Buffalo	25.	Colombus
26.	Cleveland	26.	San Jose	26.5	Cleveland
27.	Nassau	27.	Milwaukee	26.5	Chicago
28.	Boston	28.	Anaheim	28.	Nassau
29.	Houston	29.	Denver	29.	Milwaukee
30.	New York	30.	Columbus	30.	Houston

* Rates and hours ranking results from averaging the ranks for rates and the ranks for hours and, in turn, "ranking" these averages.

Volunteering Rates

In SMSA's with high rates of volunteers, three key factors characterize the composition of the volunteer force in terms of the period during which the respondents recalled having initially entered the field:

* Percentage of those who became volunteers in the 1950's is above the national standard. This is typical of 9 of the highest ranking SMSA's (Table 44, under Rates) except for Pittsburgh.
* The annual hours of the volunteers who entered the field in the 1960's exceed the national average: a pattern appearing in the top 9 SMSA's, save for St. Louis.
* Frequency of annual volunteering for the most recent entrants (1970-1974) exceeds the national average: this, in turn, characterizes the highest 16 SMSA's except for Buffalo, Anaheim and Atlanta.

Thus, where rates are rather high, there are many oldtimers in the volunteer corps; those who became volunteers later on, but not most recently, (1960's), spend many hours; and the most recent entrants (1970-1974) are active most frequently.

Two further factors, both having to do with initial reasons for having become a volunteer, are of importance:

* The percentage of those who gave, as their reason for initial involvement, having a "child in the program" is above the national average in the highest ranking six SMSA's (except for Indianapolis).
* The percentage of those "who couldn't refuse" when asked is also above the national average in these six SMSA's (except for Anaheim).

In turn,

* The percentage of those who gave "having a child in the program" as an important reason in continued volunteering falls below the national standard in seven of the highest rate SMSA's (except for St. Louis); and,

* Annual hours which were spent by those whose continuation plans reflect a "sense of duty" were also below the national average in nine top SMSA's--save again for St. Louis.

Finally, there are three important factors typical of the high rate SMSA's which have to do with their activities during the April week prior to the field study. In each instance, the volunteers in the respective SMSA's were above the national averages:

* Percentage of those who were active in health organizations (13 top SMSA's with Kansas City and San Francisco as exceptions).
* Percentage of those active in social welfare during the week (10 highest SMSA's, save for Kansas City and Seattle).
* Percentage of those involved, during the week, in citizenship programs (9 highest ranking SMSA's with the exception of Denver).

In the SMSA's with lower volunteering rates (higher rank numbers in Table 44 under Rates), the pattern is a different one. Only one factor bearing on the time of entry into voluntarism is crucial:

* The percentage of oldest volunteers (those who entered before 1950) is below the national average (in 6 SMSA's with the lowest rates).

Two of the characteristic factors have to do with religious-only, and with other-than-religious-only volunteers:

* The frequency of volunteering on the part of religious-only volunteers is above the national average in ten of the lowest rate SMSA's (except for Cleveland); and,
* The annual hours of volunteers other than those involved in religious activities only are below the national average: a pattern typical of the six lowest rate SMSA's (with New York as an exception).

Initial reasons for volunteering, as well as reasons to continue, are also important:

* The percentage of those who initially "wanted to help others" as a reason for having become volunteers falls below the national average in five of the "bottom" SMSA's (in Boston, it is at the national average).

* However, the frequency of volunteering for those who initially "wanted to help" is higher than the national norm--in eight of the low rate SMSA's.
* Those who volunteered for reasons "other" than those which were explicitly postulated in the questionnaires was higher than the nation's average in nine of these SMSA's (save for Newark).
* The percentage of those whose desire to "help others" was a key reason to wish to continue volunteering was lower than the national standard in the least rate five SMSA's (ranks 26 through 30, Table 44).
* The volunteering frequency, 1973-1974, for those whose "sense of duty" was a factor in continued voluntarism was above the nation's average in the bottom 10 SMSA's with Cleveland as the exception.
* In the same ten SMSA's (and with Cleveland again an exception), the average hours per volunteering occasion were above the national average whose reason for continued volunteering was "having a child in the program".

Finally,

* In the nine lowest rate SMSA's, involvement in educational organizations during the April week was below the national average for such activities.

What can we say about SMSA's which are neither very high nor quite low in terms of volunteering rates? Three factors, above all, differentiate them from the higher rate SMSA's:

* The high rate SMSA's had below average percentages of volunteers who planned to continue their activity because they "had a child in the program", but the medium rate SMSA's have an above average percentage of such volunteers (a pattern typical of SMSA's with Ranks 8 through 14; that is, Buffalo through Washington, D.C. of Table 44).
* The higher rate SMSA's had volunteers who spent fewer than average hours volunteering when they stated that their reasons to continue had to do with their "sense of duty". The medium rate SMSA's (Ranks 14 through 19, Washington, D.C., San Bernardino, Passaic, San Diego, Detroit and

Dallas) were above the nation's average in this regard.

- Volunteers who were active in the April week in social welfare organizations were above the average in the high rate SMSA's: they were below average in the medium rate areas (Ranks 11 through 21, except for San Diego).

The remaining configuration of variables which characterize the "medium rate" SMSA's is different from both the higher and the lower rate areas.

- The percentage of those who plan to continue volunteering out of a "sense of duty" was below the nation's average (Ranks 10 through 20, except for Passaic).
- The annual hours of religious-only volunteers were above the average in SMSA's with ranks 10 through 23 (except for Columbus and Washington, D.C., ranked 13th and 14th, respectively).
- Annual hours of those who planned to continue volunteering because they wanted "to help others" were above the average in Washington, D.C., San Bernardino, Passaic, San Diego, Detroit, Dallas and Baltimore (Ranks 14 through 20).
- Annual hours of more regular volunteers were above the nation's standard (Ranks 14 through 24, except for Milwaukee); and,
- In the same SMSA's (also except for Milwaukee), hours spent per volunteering event by the more regular volunteers were also above the average, as were
- Hours per event spent by religious-only volunteers, typical of SMSA's with Ranks 18 through 23 (Detroit, Dallas, Baltimore, Milwaukee, Philadelphia and Los Angeles).

Volunteering Hours

If the configurations relating to volunteering rates are rather sharp and distinct for SMSA's with high, medium and lower rates, they are even more sharp in terms of average annual volunteering hours.

Here, then, is the strongest finding:

- In 15 higher average hours SMSA's, the annual hours spent by those who became volunteers due to their desire to "help others" are above the nation's average.
- In the remaining 15 SMSA's where annual hours yield a lower average, those who became volunteers because of their desire "to help others" spent less than average time during 1973-1974.

There is no exception to this pattern.

Four variables characterize the 13 SMSA's with highest annual hours per volunteer:

- Annual hours spent by regular volunteers are above the national average, as are
- Hours per volunteering event on the part of these more regular participants,
- Hours per event on non-religious (that is, not religious-only) volunteers, and
- Hours per event invested by those who initially became volunteers to "help others".

Furthermore, in these 13 SMSA's, with Washington, D.C. (ranked 7th) the exception,

- The annual hours of those who planned to continue their activity and gave "enjoyment" as a major reason were also above the nation's average.

Other key differentiating factors include:

- Annual volunteering frequency was above average in nine of the highest time investment cities;
- Hours per volunteering event were above the nation's standard in 11 SMSA's with highest overall hourly averages;
- The percentage of more regular, rather than occasional, volunteers exceeded the national average in 7 SMSA's (of course, this means: Ranks 1 through 7).
- Annual hours spent by more occasional volunteers were above the norm in 9 SMSA's (except for Dallas, ranked 5th).
- Annual hours of volunteers who were active not only in religious organizations were above the average in the top 10 SMSA's.

- Annual hours spent by volunteers who entered the field before 1960 were above the average in nine top SMSA's (with Passaic as the sole exception).
- Annual hours of the most recent volunteers (who entered 1970-1974) were above the average in 16 SMSA's (except for ranks 11 and 12, San Diego and Baltimore, respectively).
- Frequency of volunteering events was above the nation's average in the top eight SMSA's for the most recent (1970 and later) volunteers.
- Hours per volunteering occasion were also higher than average among them in 11 SMSA's (except for Dallas and San Bernardino, Ranks 5 and 6, respectively).
- The percentage of those who became volunteers because of a "sense of duty" exceeded the national average in the top nine SMSA's.
- In the same SMSA's, the percentage of those who became volunteers because they "could not refuse", also exceeded the national average.
- This is also the case for those who responded that they "had a child in the program".

Dallas was an exception in the "sense of duty" pattern; Washington, D.C., was at the national average with respect to the "child in the program" factor, but the 10th ranking SMSA (Newark) shared this characteristic with the other areas with high annual volunteering hours.

Two more major variables were typical of the "high hours" SMSA's:

- Annual hours spent by those who gave their desire "to help others" as a reason for wanting to continue volunteering (12 top SMSA's except for 9th ranked Philadelphia); and,
- Annual hours spent by those who gave their "sense of duty" as a reason for continued volunteering (the highest 11 SMSA's).

In both instances, the high hour SMSA's were above the national average on these factors.

The SMSA's which are lower on annual volunteering hours are also lower on many common factors:

* The annual frequency of volunteering is below national average (in 7 lowest time investment SMSA's except for Denver, 29th);
* The hours spent per volunteering event are below the average (lowest five SMSA's);
* The percentage of more regular volunteers is lower (seven MSSA's, save for Milwaukee);
* The annual hours of more occasional volunteers are lower than average (14 SMSA's, with Anaheim, 28th, the exception);
* The hours per event on the part of occasional volunteers are lower than average in 13 lower annual hours SMSA's, except for Buffalo and Anaheim;
* The annual hours of more regular volunteers are lower than average (in 12 SMSA's, save for Detroit);
* The hours per event on the part of more regular participants are lower (in five "bottom" SMSA's);
* The annual hours of volunteers who are not active in religious organizations only are lower than average (in 14 SMSA's);
* The hours per event invested by volunteers other than the religious-only ones are lower than the average (in 13 SMSA's with lowest annual hours except for Kansas City, and for Buffalo and Anaheim, where in the latter two SMSA's, the time investment is at the national average);
* The annual hours of oldtimers (volunteers before 1960) are below the average (six SMSA's, with San Jose the exception);
* The volunteering frequency of the 1960-1969 volunteers is below the nation's average (eight SMSA's in the highest rank numbers);
* The annual hours of those who became volunteers because of "enjoyment" are below average (seven SMSA's), as are

- * In the same 7 SMSA's (Ranks 24 through 30), the annual hours of those who joined initially because they "had a child in the program".
- * The hours per event of those who initially became volunteers out of a desire to "help others" were below average (in the lowest annual time investment SMSA's with Ranks 14 through 30, except for Detroit, 24th, and San Diego, 26th).
- * In the lowest "time-spent" SMSA's with Ranks 21-30 (with the exception of Detroit), the hours spent by those who gave their "desire to help others" as a reason to continue were below the nation's standard.
- * As were, in the same SMSA's (and with the same, Detroit, exception), hours of those whose reason for continuing to volunteer involved a "sense of duty".

On most of these characteristics, the higher and lower annual time investment SMSA's are distinctly differentiated in that the higher SMSA's are above, and the lower, below, the nation's average.

We have not mentioned four additional factors bearing on the composition of the volunteer force which are typical of the high hours SMSA's but not of the low hour ones:

- * The percentage of 1950-1959 entrants was below the nation's average (five SMSA's).
- * The percentage of those who became volunteers in 1960-1964, and 1965-1969 was also below the national average.
- * The percentage of most recent participants (those who became volunteers in 1970 and thereafter) was above the national norm.

The significant variables for SMSA's with medium annual hours of volunteering are different from those associated with highest and lowest time investments. There are, of course, some overlaps on both ends of the continuum: the "presence" of the activity patterns characterizing the "medium" hours SMSA's thus helps to explain why they may not be as high in volunteering hours as the very high ones even though they share other common attirbutes with them, or as low as the lower ones even though they, similarly, are like them in some respects.

Here, then, are the main characterizations of SMSA's with medium-high, medium, and medium-low hours. Indeed, many of the high hours SMSA's "overlap" the characterization of the first subset of SMSA's:

* SMSA's with Ranks 3 through 15 are above the national average in hours per event on the part of those who gave their desire "to help others" as a reason for continued volunteering.

Since the wish to "help others" is the single strongest variable differentiating the higher and the lower SMSA's, it follows that these areas, Ranks 3 through 15, are among the higher hours cities relative to the initial reason for entry into volunteering.

* The percentage who volunteered because "they had nothing else to do" is above the national average among the "higher" medium SMSA's (Ranks 7 through 15); and,
* It is lower than the national average among the "lower" medium SMSA's (Ranks 19 through 27, except for Detroit, 24th).

The higher, and somewhat less than higher, annual hours separating the top eight SMSA's from others have to do with

* Lower than national average frequency of volunteering on the part of more occasional volunteers (typical of Ranks 9 through 13);

and also,

* The percentage of those who gave as a reason for continued volunteering that they "had nothing else to do"--a percentage which fell above the national average for SMSA's with Ranks 9 through 18 (except for Pittsburgh, Rank 16, and Atlanta, Rank 17, with Atlanta being at the national average in this regard).

Finally, we find three characteristics of the truly "medium" annual hours SMSA's:

* Annual hours of religious-only volunteers were below the nation's average (Ranks 15 through 23, except for Atlanta, 17th).

* Hours per volunteering event of religious volunteers were also below the nation's average (Ranks 15 through 23 without exception); and,
* Hours per volunteering occasion by those who entered the field in the 1960's were above the national norm (Ranks 19 through 26, thus 8 SMSA's in the middle of the overall distribution).

Rates and Hours

When the SMSA's are ordered by both rates of volunteering and average annual hours (Table 44, under Rates and Hours) and the patterns of voluntarism in these 30 SMSA's are considered, we get rather clear distinctions between higher and lower ranking SMSA's. That is, these differences exist between those SMSA's which have ralatively high rates and hours, and those with relatively low rates and hours. Except for one variable (percentage of those who became volunteers in the latter half of the 1960's, typical of the top six ranked SMSA's), the SMSA's in the lower ranks (and thus with higher rates-and-hours) are above the national average in factors which are most characteristic of them; the lower rates-and-hours SMSA's, in turn, are below the national average.

Table 45 summarizes the variables in the configuration of SMSA's with higher rates and hours; Table 46 gives a roster of factors involved in SMSA's with lower rates and hours. Of the 20 variables of Table 45 (all except one, cited above, exceeding the nation's average), 10 appear on the list of factors of the lower rates-and-hours SMSA's where they all fall below the national average.

Two of the characterizations differentiate between higher and lower hours-and-rates SMSA's almost as sharply as to produce a clear-cut dichotomization:

* Annual hours of the oldest core of volunteers (those who entered before 1960): when the time investment of these volunteers is above the nation's average, the SMSA's are among the top 17 in both hours and rates (with three exceptions); when the time expenditure of these volunteers is below the national standard, the SMSA has lower rates-and-hours (with two exceptions).

Table 45

CONFIGURATIONS OF VOLUNTEERING BEHAVIOR IN SMSA'S WITH BOTH HIGHER RATES AND HOURS

Above National Average	Characteristic Of*
Hours per volunteering occasion	10 SMSA's (ranks 1 through 10)
Hours annually spent by more occasional volunteers	4 SMSA's (1 - 4)
Hours per event spent by more occasional volunteers	11 SMSA's (1 through 11, except for Kansas City)
Hours spent by regulars	8 SMSA's, except for Kansas City
Frequency of volunteering events on the part of regulars	8 SMSA's, except for Kansas City
Hours per event spent by more regular volunteers	10 top SMSA's
Annual hours spent by other than religious-only volunteers	11 SMSA's (except for Kansas City and Buffalo)
Frequency of volunteering of other than religious-only volunteers	11 SMSA's (except for Kansas City and Buffalo)
Hours per event spent by volunteers who have done only religious work	10 SMSA's (with Buffalo at the the national average)
Annual hours spent by those who became volunteers before 1960	12 SMSA's (except for Buffalo and Passaic) or 17 SMSA's (except for the above and also Atlanta)
Hours spent by those who became volunteers in the 1970's	8 SMSA's (except for Kansas City)
Frequency of volunteering for the 1970-1974 entrants	8 SMSA's
Hours spent by those who became volunteers to "help others"	8 SMSA's (except for Kansas City)
Hours spent by those who became volunteers out of a "sense of duty"	8 SMSA's (except for Seattle)

Table 45

CONFIGURATIONS OF VOLUNTEERING BEHAVIOR IN SMSA'S WITH BOTH HIGHER RATES AND HOURS

Above National Average	Characteristic of
Hours spent by those who entered the field due to "enjoyment"	17 SMSA's (except for Dallas, Seattle and Buffalo)
Hours per volunteering event spent by those who became initially volunteers out of a "sense of duty"	10 SMSA's (except for Seattle)
Hours per event spent by those who became volunteers due to "enjoyment"	10 SMSA's (except for Seattle and Washington, D.C. with the latter SMSA's being at the national average)
Percent with plans to continue voluntary activity	10 SMSA's (except for San Francisco)
Hours per event for those who gave "enjoyment" as a reason for continued volunteering plans	10 SMSA's (except for Seattle)
Below the National Average	
Percent of those who became volunteers in the late 1960's (1965-1969)	6 SMSA's

*Whenever a number of SMSA's is mentioned, this always means the lowest ranking subset of SMSA's is involved (with highest rates and hours) and the SMSA referred to as an exception, if any, does not follow the dominant pattern among the ranks of SMSA's mentioned.

Table 46

CONFIGURATIONS OF VOLUNTEERING BEHAVIOR IN SMSA'S WITH BOTH LOWER RATES AND HOURS

Below the National Average	Characteristic of
* Hours per volunteering event	6 "bottom" SMSA's (Ranks 25 through 30)
* Hours spent by more occasional volunteers	10 SMSA's (except for Boston)
* Hours per event spent by the more occasional volunteers	10 SMSA's (except for Boston)
* Hours spent by regular volunteers	4 SMSA's (Ranks 27-30)
* Hours per event spent by regulars	12 SMSA's (except for Newark and Detroit)
* Hours spent by volunteers other than the religious-only ones	9 SMSA's
* Hours per event spent by volunteers other than the religious-only participants	9 SMSA's
Percent of religious-only volunteers	13 SMSA's
Percent of those who became volunteers before 1950	9 SMSA's
* Hours spent by those who became participants before 1960	13 SMSA's (except for Cleveland and Chicago)
* Hours spent by those who initially became volunteers out of a desire to "help others"	12 SMSA's (except for Newark and Boston)
* Hours spent by those who became volunteers due to "enjoyment"	13 SMSA's (except for Houston and Cleveland)
* Hours per event spent by those who became volunteers to "help others"	6 SMSA's
* Hours spent by those who became volunteers due to "enjoyment"	13 SMSA's (except for Houston and Cleveland)

Table 46 (Continued)

CONFIGURATIONS OF VOLUNTEERING BEHAVIOR IN SMSA'S WITH BOTH LOWER RATES AND HOURS

Below the National Average	Characteristics of
Hours per event spent by those who became volunteers to "help others"	6 SMSA's
Hours per event spent by those who entered the field because of "a child in the program"	12 SMSA's (except for Columbus and Newark)
Hours per event spent by those whose reason to continue volunteering was their desire to "help others"	6 SMSA's
Hours per event spent by those whose reason to continue was their "sense of duty"	6 SMSA's

* All items asterisked appear also in Table 45 as characteristic of higher rates-and-hours SMSA's: but in Table 45 they have above, rather than below, average values.

- Enjoyment of the activity as a key reason for initial involvement: when the percentage is above the nation's norm, the 17 cities (with three exceptions) are highest in both rates and hours; when the percentage of those who joined due to "enjoyment" is below the nation's average (in the remaining 13 SMSA's with two exceptions), the SMSA's are lower in both rates and hours.

The other major variables of Tables 45 and 46 point to the extremes of the rates-and-hours ordering. What can be, finally, said about the SMSA's in the middle grouping of the ranks?

Three variables are particularly important:

- The percentage of those who became volunteers out of a "sense of duty" is below the national average (13 SMSA's with Ranks 9 through 21, except for Denver).
- The frequency of annual volunteering of those who did work only for religious organizations is above the nation's average (Ranks 9 through 17, except for Pittsburgh); and,
- The volunteering frequency for those whose initial reason for participation was having "a child in the program" was also above the nation's mean (SMSA's with Ranks 11 through 19).

One further variable differentiates between SMSA's which are, among the ones in the middle of the overall rank order, higher and those that are lower:

- Hours per volunteering event spent by those who became volunteers because their child was in the program are above the national average in Minneapolis, Kansas City, San Bernardino, Washington, D.C., Buffalo and Dallas (Ranks 5 through 10); hours per event are below the national average in SMSA's with Ranks 11 through 22, except for Anaheim.

Given these results of our analysis as they pertain to configurations of volunteering motivations and behavior in SMSA's with highly variable annual rates of volunteers, average annual hours of time spent volunteering, and both rates and hours variability, what can be said about policy and operational implications? To consider such ramifications is then the main purpose of the last chapter of the report.

XV. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

We cannot but begin our effort to arrive at some policy-relevant conclusions with the highlights of the findings. We shall now present, first of all, the major points as simple assertions:

1. In the 106 SMSA's volunteering rates vary by a factor of 5.7 (the highest rate is 5.7 times as high as the lowest one).
2. In the 106 SMSA's, annual average volunteering hours vary by a factor of almost 21.
3. Rates and hours are essentially uncorrelated, with rho = -.018 for the 106 SMSA's.
4. On balance, the "average" volunteer was active about once every 1.5 weeks (35 times during the year).
5. Volunteering frequencies vary among 30 SMSA's by a factor of 2.
6. Hours spent for each volunteering occasion vary, approximately, by a factor of 2, between two hours per event and almost four hours per event.
7. Annual frequency of volunteering has a small, but not altogether negligible, negative correlation, rho = -.172, with volunteering rates.
8. Annual frequency has a high volunteering hours correlation, rho = .658.
9. More regular volunteers, in terms of annual hours spent, varied from occasional ones within the SMSA's by as much as a factor of 10.
10. Since the difference was only by a factor of 1.4 at the other extreme, variability among the SMSA's was again very high.
11. Occasional volunteers, however, spent roughly twice as much time on each volunteering occasion as did the regular ones.
12. But there was high variability among the SMSA's in this regard, and in some of the 30 major ones, the "regular" volunteers spent more time than did the occasional ones.

13. The variation in the percentage of occasional volunteers among the 30 SMSA's was about 30 percent (25 percent low, 55 percent high).

14. The percentage of volunteers who had been, up to the time of the study, involved in religious activities only varied by a factor of over 8.

15. Overall volunteering rate in the SMSA's was uncorrelated (in fact, slightly negatively correlated, rho = -.029) with rate of religious-only volunteering.

16. The percentage of religious-only volunteers was modestly and positively related to annual hours per volunteer (rho = .350).

17. The percentage of religious-only volunteers was modestly and positively correlated with frequency of volunteering events over the year (rho = .220).

18. But the percentages of religious-only volunteers do not account for the overall SMSA variability in either annual hours or in volunteering frequencies.

19. The time invested by religious-only volunteers varies by a factor of 22 among the 30 SMSA's.

20. The frequencies of volunteering of religious-only volunteers vary by a factor of 8.5 among the 30 large SMSA's.

21. In 12 SMSA's (of the 30 specifically considered), the most recent entrants into voluntarism (1970-1974) exceed 50 percent of all volunteers.

22. In six SMSA's, the most recent volunteers represent less than one-third of all participants.

23. In three SMSA's, the plurality of volunteers began their activities before 1950, and in four SMSA's, in the 1960's.

24. The volunteers of an earlier vintage exceed the more recent ones in annual volunteering hours but there is, again, great variability among the SMSA's.

25. The average hours spent per each volunteering occasion are also consistently higher for the participants who became volunteers years ago rather than more recently.

26. But in some SMSA's, the more recent entrants into the field of voluntary activity exceed, in hours spent, the oldtimers by almost a factor of 3.

27. Whichever period the largest cohort of volunteers comes from in each SMSA, the larger is the time investment (average annual hours) of that cohort.

28. The most important reasons for initial involvement as volunteers involve the desire to help others, sense of enjoyment, having a child in the program, and a sense of duty.

29. The 30 large SMSA's, however, vary in the way in which the major reasons are selected by the volunteers in these SMSA's.

30. Across the 30 SMSA's, there is sharp variability in percentages of respondents who chose any given reason for initial volunteering.

31. Similar variations, both with regard to reasons within SMSA's and with regard to given reasons across the SMSA's, exists in terms of annual hours per volunteer, volunteering frequencies, and hours per volunteering event.

32. Regardless of reasons for initial involvement, correlations (for the 30 SMSA's) between annual rates and annual hours are negligible.

33. Only "enjoyment" as a reason has a positive correlation between volunteering rates and annual frequencies (rho = +.313).

34. Annual hours and annual frequencies are correlated for respondents across the 30 SMSA's for each of the major reason categories considered--the lowest positive correlation (rho = .390) is for those who gave "having a child in the program" as a reason, and the highest one, rho = .648, their "sense of duty" as a factor.

35. The variation among the 106 SMSA's in terms of those who planned to continue their voluntary activity is about by a factor of 2.3.

36. In the 30 SMSA's on which more detailed data were used in our analysis, the variation is smaller, but still important: the lowest rate is of 1.3 times lower than the highest one.

37. Reasons for continued volunteering are as variable within SMSA's as well as across them for each given reason as were the statements of motivations for initial involvement.

38. Percentages of those who gave a particular initial reason and those who gave the same reason for continuation of voluntary activities yield positive correlations for the 30 SMSA's, except that the correlation for "enjoyment" as both an initial and continuation reason is much lower (rho = .178) than are the others ("to help others," "sense of duty," "child in program").

39. Correlations between percentages of those who planned to continue and gave their desire to help as well as their sense of duty as reasons are positive--though low (rho = .159, and rho = .068 respectively).

40. The corresponding correlations for those who gave as their continuation reasons "enjoyment" or "having a child in the program" are negative (rho = -.188, and rho = -.384, respectively).

41. Annual hours, annual frequencies, and hours per volunteering event are highly variable among the SMSA's for any given continued volunteering reason: Different reasons yield different hours, frequencies, and hours per event in various SMSA's; the same reasons yield highly variable hours, frequencies and hours per event among the SMSA's.

42. For each of the reason categories, overall annual hours and annual frequencies yield high and positive correlations.

43. The variation among the 106 SMSA's in percentages of those who considered volunteering but did not carry out their intentions goes from over 20 percent of 1973-1974 non-volunteers to zero percent.

44. In the 106 SMSA's, the higher the percentage of actual (1973-1974) volunteers, the higher tended to be the percentage of those who had considered volunteering.

45. In the 106 SMSA's, the higher the percentage of those who considered volunteering, the lower the average annual hours per actual 1973-1974 volunteer.

46. Health system related activities were most often considered by those who thought about volunteering but did not do so during the year under study.

47. When we considered the impact on the volunteer system of all 1973-1974 volunteers who did not plan to continue their activities, but those who considered volunteering actually becoming activated (or, in fact, percentages of others of that order of magnitude), we found that the subsequent year's activities, 1974-1975, would have involved net gains in 57 SMSA's; net losses in 35 of them; and no net change in 14.

48. High variation was found, for the 106 SMSA's (as well as the 30 among them on whom we had focused in greater detail) in percentages of volunteers who invested some time during the week of April 7 through 13, 1974 as well as in the average hours each of such volunteers reported to have spent during that week.

49. Even though religious volunteering was dominant during this April week (a week of both Passover and Easter in the year 1974), there was high variation among the SMSA's in the percentage of religious voluntarism. The highest rate was higher by a factor of 7 in the 30 large SMSA's.

50. Types of activities other than religious were, in fact, dominant in several SMSA's, or were at least as important as participation in voluntary efforts in religious organizations.

51. In predicting the week's volunteering rates from other data of the study, we find that in most SMSA's (among the large 30), more volunteering would have been expected than occurred in religious activities, and less volunteering than did take place in health activities.

The results of the configurational analysis (of Chapter XIII) need not be repeated. They have, in fact, been summarized when presented.

What are some of the major implications? Again, we shall consider volunteering rates first, annual hours of volunteers next, and both rates and hours last. The obvious operational and policy questions seem to be of two kinds:

A. How can high volunteering rates, or high hours, or both high hours and rates be best maintained (if not increased further)?

B. How can medium or lower rates, average hours and rates and hours be increased?

These, we think, are among the key issues which face policy makers at the national, ACTION, level as well as volunteer program coordinators at the levels of the nation's cities and city-surrounding areas. We do not assume that the need for more volunteers or for more time per volunteer is insatiable though it may well be that. But we do want to address the generic issues: *if* more volunteers were needed, and *if*, once they volunteer, they were to invest more time, what might be the circumstances conducive to that? *Whether* more volunteers are needed and where and in what kinds of activities, and *whether* more volunteering time is needed, how much of it and in what kinds of endeavors, we are not prepared to discuss at all.

In the sense of the nation's morale, however, we might well be prepared to say that the more volunteering we will have in America the better off, in a spiritual sense, we will prove to be as a nation. The more people who give of thier own time and effort to the benefit of others, the better off we are likely to be as a people -- not, once again, necessarily in terms of material well-being, but certainly in terms of the nation's soul.

From this, admittedly ideologically and philosophically grounded premise, it follows that we are not interested in discussing how volunteering might be reduced, or how people who volunteer might be enticed to do less than they have been doing hitherto. We are, in fact, precisely at the other end of a plausible spectrum of attitudes: we would be pleased if there were more volunteering, and if more time were spent by each volunteer.

Recognizing, and making explicit, our biases in this regard provides an explanation why our search for implications is truncated in one direction only: toward more voluntarism in the United States.

The high, even extreme, *variability* on all key characteristics under analysis is, perhaps, the strategic finding of our study. The SMSA's are *not* homogeneous with respect to any one of the over 90 variables explicitly considered for some 30 of the SMSA's, nor for the fewer variables viewed from the perspective of 106 SMSA's.

Since volunteers, almost by definition or, if you wish, of necessity, are active in a relatively localized *context*, this variability has profound implications for the way ACTION may think about its policies and plans.

1. Given the data, standarized, nation-wide policy planning and programming would not be as appropriate or as prudent, as planning which takes local variability explicitly into account, whether it comes to mobilizability of new volunteers (given variations in motivations and variations in interests of those who have considered volunteering but did not do so), or to maintenance of high volunteering, or to increasing of the volunteering time, or to redirecting the efforts of extant volunteers and their extant time investments into activities where they might be needed more.
2. The human as well as monetary costs of mobilization, retention and time investment increments or activity redirection are, by implication, highly variable from national location to national location so that "programming-by-objective" (in locally disaggregated form) rather than "equal" or "near-equal" programming of effort would be indicated.
3. At the national level, such "programming-by-objective" may entail choices among competing options, or a choice of a mix of such options:
   * whether it is more important to maintain, or even increase, volunteering strength where it already exists; or,
   * whether it is more important to enhance the mobilization of new volunteers, or added effort of extant volunteers, in areas where voluntarism could prosper more (by tapping additional volunteer resources and/or by increasing the involvement of those already volunteering).
4. A further critical choice involves the degree of emphasis on
   * volunteer need oriented efforts,

   as contrasted with

* national morale building, sustaining and enhancing efforts almost regardless of "actual need" for volunteers (in numbers of time expenditures).

5. It seems clearly obvious from the data, and from the conclusions we derive from the data, that careful monitoring of changes at the most disaggregated local levels would allow ACTION to keep iterating approaches and solutions pointed to under points 1 through 4 above.
6. Given the data we have, it seems also rather clear that ACTION can therefore serve, or continue serving, as a national coordinator and integrator of multifaceted activities and volunteering problems which, in reality, are highly heterogeneous at local levels rather than as any kind of Federal "supervisor" or focal point from which all major policies and plans derive.

If policies and plans of ACTION are, in fact, basically in keeping with these types of points, this is all to the better. For these are not recommendations that we have somehow made up. They derive from the national reality, and the national reality is imbedded in the best available data we have on hand so far: the large 1974 survey of volunteering.

If policies and plans of ACTION were, at this time, guided by considerations different from those which we have sought to highlight, we recommend that considerable thought be given to the suggestions which we have specified in order to determine whether they might not provide a better approach. In fact, we are convinced that they would.

The major implications for VAC, or equivalent, coordinators are of the following kind:

1. "Standardized" approaches to mobilization of new volunteers, retention of extant ones, increase in the activity of the current volunteers, maintenance of current types of activities or redirecting of current types of activities into more needed are not likely to work. Each local area has very distinct opportunities and very distinct problems in availing itself of these opportunities.

2. In fact, great opportunities for learning in the national voluntarism system at more local levels present themselves because of the nature of the data: almost each locality (here, we were able to deal with SMSA's as the lowest level of disaggregation) has some strengths and some weaknesses in terms of volunteering rates, hours, motivational structures, frequencies of volunteering, and so on. Systematic sharing of factual information would go a long way toward enabling each coordinating agency to learn from the strengths of other local areas and to share insights into the particular strengths of its own so that they can, in turn, learn from it.
3. Different localities require, given the extant situation, somewhat different approaches, given their need structures, for volunteer mobilization and retention, for increased involvement of current (and additionally mobilized) volunteers, and for channeling of willing participants into activities where their help can best benefit the community (and through it, our society).
4. The local VAC coordinators have to consider the facts of their particular situation, and monitor changes therein, if they are to maximize their opportunities. At least for some of the SMSA's, our data provide detailed analysis to some of the more local variations which need to be taken into account.

Let us now consider how high volunteering rates might be maintained in those SMSA's in which they are already quite high. This amounts to saying that we seek to prevent attrition of those who have already made a commitment to voluntary activity in the past.

Here, the researchers must probe meanings behind meanings. Thus, some speculation is involved. Yet, nothing we have to offer is not derivable from the data at hand, even though not always in a single-step fashion. In general, we shall proceed with our more concrete suggestions in this manner throughout the rest of the analysis.

1. If there are many oldtimers among the volunteers, the overall rates are likely to be high in such SMSA's.
2. If there are volunteers who have served for about 5 to 15 years (with the "oldtimers" having been involved more than 25 years), high hours per volunteer can be expected.
3. If there are many newcomers (last 5 or so years) into volunteering, high frequency of involvement is associated with high rates of voluntarism in the area.

Roughly then, oldtimers can increase the overall pool of volunteers, but they can be counted on to spend less time and be involved less frequently than others. Volunteers of some years can be expected to spend many hours if they have continued volunteering as it is. Newcomers can be expected to be active many times during the year--but there are not necessarily many of them, nor do they spend a great deal of time overall or on each occasion.

a. Thus, activities which involve greater numbers of people but lower regularities and lower time investments seem most suitable for oldtimers: they are oldtimers also in terms of age, since none of the volunteers who entered the field before 1950 is likely to be less than 40 years old, and most are older by far than that.
b. Thus, activities which require high overall expenditures of hours, but not necessarily many hours each time and not necessarily high regularity, are best suited for those who have been volunteers for 5 to 15 years (or, who at least began their volunteering in such a period antecedant today).
c. Thus, activities which involve regularity and high frequency over the year, but not necessarily many hours per year or even per volunteering event are best suited for those who are relative newcomers.

Furthermore, initial motivations involving having a child or children in a particular program are important. Where there are many such people, the rates are high. But lower percentages of so motivated people are better as continuing volunteers.

At the same time, those who "can't refuse" (people hard to identify in any way except by asking them!) make, as initial motives, for a large pool of volunteers. And those with a "sense of duty" as a reason to continue tend to be associated with higher rates when there are fewer of them.

Let us put these pieces together and couple them, as much as possible, with the length of the volunteer's history.

1. Additional volunteers, from among non-volunteers, might enter the field because of their child(ren) and if such opportunities were known to these individuals, more of them would be drawn into volunteering.
2. "Asking" people to volunteer is obviously an effective method. Quite a few "cannot refuse when asked" and this, too, would sustain, or increase the volunteering rate.
3. Those with children when asked, therefore, can be expected to have even higher propensities to volunteer, propensities which might not be activated unless their child is in an appropriate program or unless they are asked to get involved (perhaps along with their child).
4. Once people volunteer because their child(ren) particiapte(s) in the program requiring, or encouraging, their help, the main rationale for their participation needs to be somewhat modified. If they acquire an alternative motivation, chances that they will continue (and maintain the high volunteering rate) are better than if they maintain their original rationale ("Having a child in the program").
5. Since oldtimers' high percentages relate to high rates in SMSA's, it is not inconceivable at all that the "can't refuse" motivation could be made operative particularly among people who had had prior volunteering experience years ago; more concretely, among older people. To say that a motivation would be made "operative" may sound crass. That is not the intention of the statement. It merely describes a high probability for older people to volunteer once asked to do so because they "can't say no" when asked.

6. Furthermore, we find that the April week's activities among volunteers in the high rate SMSA's involved health, welfare and citizenship organizations. Thus, appeals (by simply asking) to become involved in these classes of activities are likely to be heeded more than appeals to other community needs than these.
7. The "health organization" appeal, as a way of sustaining, or enhancing, volunteering rates is a particularly obvious one: many of those who considered volunteering but did not actually do so emphasize that "health-related" activities were precisely what they had considered.
8. In the high rate SMSA's, those who emphasized their "sense of duty" as a factor in continuing voluntarism were below the national average. This suggests that a feeling of obligation is not the best mechansim to maintain high volunteering rates.
   Other motivations need to be considered, and this can, given the data, best be done by focus on the kinds of activities which are of particular interest to those respondents who live in high rate SMSA's: health social welfare and citizenship organizations. In fact, the key has to do with deemphasis of any pattern of communications that suggests a volunteering obligation of any kind once the volunteer has become active. In turn, we repeat, the "can't refuse" phenomenon is quite important in the entry into voluntarism, and the "can't refuse" people, too, in an important manner act out of a "sense of duty" of a more limited kind.

How can volunteering rates be increased above and beyond the sustaining, and some enhancing, recommendations which we have already specified?

1. Having a child in the program as a reason to continue does not decrease volunteering rates (when the reason is frequent in an SMSA) from high to low. It decreases them from high to medium. We have already stated that: this is a motivation which is salutory in terms of local

rates to entry into volunteering, but somewhat detrimental to continued activity.

2. Similarly, continued volunteering out of a sense of duty induces medium, not higher, rates, while fewer people who keep up their activity out of a sense of duty tend to characterize the SMSA's with higher rates.
3. Both of these motivations then, having a child in the program and volunteering out of a sense of duty, could induce higher volunteering rates if they were supplanted by alternative rationale among those who do, in fact, become volunteers.
4. There are not very many people among the non-volunteers who considered social welfare activities. But there are, as it were, enough of them. Medium rates are associated with below average activism in social welfare, but higher rates go along with higher social welfare activism. The Americans who are latently interested in social welfare organizations could clearly be tapped (and they would become active initially because they "can't refuse", because of a "sense of duty") to expand the pool of volunteers.
5. In the SMSA's with low volunteering rates, the percentage of oldtimers is low. We have already argued that this group, which can be relied on for numbers of volunteers but less for regularities or overall time investments, might be particularly amenable to the "can't refuse" approach, and specifically, as we have seen, for health and social welfare activities (and partially, citizenship ones).
6. Volunteers who initially entered the field to "help others" are less frequent in the low rate SMSA's. An enhancement of such an appeal then would increase the rate though not necessarily to a high one. But it would have the effect of an increment in the numbers of available volunteers. Oldtimers, once again, would seem very approachable on the altruistic basis of voluntary involvement, apart from the sharper increment in volunteer rates which the "can't refuse" newcomers would yield.

7. In the lower rate SMSA's, volunteers who were (in the April week) involved in educational activities were below the national average. An increase of such involvements (and there are enough of those Americans who had considered, but not actualized, educational volunteering) would also increase the overall volunteering rate.

The data on SMSA's with high volunteering hours give us clues to the variables which might be conducive to maintaining high annual time investments of those poeple who are, or do become volunteers.

1. When relative oldtimers (pre-1960 entrants) spend a great deal of time, the SMSA's tend to be characterized by high annual hours per volunteer. "Helping others", a "sense of duty" and inability to "refuse" are important motivations also associated with high annual time expenditures.

   Stregthening of such motivations, especially among the "oldtimers" would then enhance annual time investments--and, as we have seen before, especially the "can't refuse" factor would be important in expanding even the volunteering rates.

2. But such initial motivations need to be coupled particularly, for all volunteers but especially for the oldtimers, with a sense of enjoyment if the effort is to be sustained. Thus, "helping others", "inability to refuse", "sense of duty" or even "having a child in the program" might be important initially (and contribute to sustaining high hourly investments of those who started with such motivations, and, as in the case of "can't refuse" and "having a child in the program", even increasing the overall pool of volunteers) but the enjoyment factor becomes crucial for those who continue volunteering and spend many hours doing so.

3. Regularity of volunteering, and the relatively high frequency which it, in turn, induces, are important factors in high time expenditures. Clearly, higher regularity and higher volunteering frequencies can be impacted by an extant, or new, sense of enjoyment, and by a motivation to "help others".

4. High mobilization of newcomers into voluntary activities also contributes to high annual hours (as it, by definition, would to rates: here, the main motivating factor may have to do with the involvement of a child in a particular program).
5. The high annual frequency of volunteering on the part of newcomers and the amount of time they spent on each such occasion are factors in the high hour SMSA's. Insofar as "enjoyment" is a critical element in continued volunteering in SMSA's where hours spent annually are high, such a motivation seems particularly salient. The newcomers may become volunteers for a variety of reasons. But it appears that a "sense of enjoyment" has to supplement, or displace, such initial motives if they are to continue--and if, therefore, the high time investments in local areas are to be maintained.
6. In SMSA's with medium volunteering hours, the more occasional volunteers are characterized by lower than average frequency of their involvements. To the extent to which such frequency could be increased, it would have the effect of increasing also volunteering hours and, at the same time, perhaps converting some of the more sporadic volunteers into regulars.
7. While the willingness to help others, when high, goes with high annual time investment, continued volunteering on these grounds tends to occur in SMSA's with only medium annual hours. But enjoyment of the activity relates to high hours among those who considered enjoyment a factor in continued volunteering. Thus, if the initial strong impulse to help others resulted in, were modified to, or supplanted by, genuine enjoyment of the volunteering effort, the effect on annual volunteering hours would be a positive one.
8. This suggests, of course, that the more occasional volunteers might become more regularized and participate more frequently precisely were enjoyment to become a key source, or one of the key sources, of their motivation for further activities.

9. Essentially, this also applies to the more regular volunteers in SMSA's with low annual hours of activity. There are fewer regular volunteers in these SMSA's, they invest fewer hours, and also spend fewer hours each time they do become active. Here, enjoyment as a factor is less likely even as an initial impetus. Were it to be enhanced, especially among those who already are regular volunteers, the annual hours in low SMSA's would be increased.

10. Volunteers other than religious ones tended to spend more than average hours per each volunteering occasion in higher annual hours SMSA's; but they spent less than the average time per event in the lower time investment SMSA's. Thus, a shift toward motivations to continue which enhance time investment would again seem to have the possibility of increasing the participation of these volunteers who have served for organizations other than religious only.

11. We have already argued that the numbers of older volunteers might be increasable and, in the context of the "can't refuse" syndrome and interest in health, social welfare, education and citizenship organizations, would affect the volunteering rates. The discovery that volunteering activities are also a major source of enjoyment, and internalization of this sense of satisfaction as a factor in continued volunteering would tend to engender higher annual hours of the oldtimers as well. Of course, if we think of mobilization of additional volunteers, it is clear that there can be no "new" pre-1950 or early 1960's entrants in late 1970's: but there can be re-entries on the part of those who do have a history of volunteering in the past and who may have discontinued their activities some years ago. The present data, however, do not make it possible to estimate the size of this potential pool of volunteers.

None of the factors which we have disucssed with regard to effects on volunteering rates is at odds with the implications of factors which we consider to serve as kinds of levers to sustain high volunteering hours, or to increase such time investments on the part of those who have become, or been, volunteers. Thus, a combination of the steps which we have outlined, indeed, is compatible with the maintenance of both high rates and high hours, and with shifts from lower rates and lower hours toward higher levels of involvement.

If eventually deriving enjoyment out of volunteering is such a crucial factor, as it seems to be indeed, then more should be said about how to make certain, or all, activities more enjoyable. We are not quite prepared to do so because there is nothing in the body of data we have scrutinized which would lead to a simple recipe. Rather, more needs to be known in this regard: what factors, for instance, hinder the volunteer's sense of satisfaction and what factors would serve as best facilitators? How do such factors relate to various types of activities and organized contexts in which the volunteers serve? What aspects of the cultural, social, as well as physical milieu might be important in these regards?

Voluntary activity, of course, is not the main way by which the nation's production and delivery of better services (and goods) gets done or can get improved. But it is a significant component of the total process in moral, economic and social terms nonetheless. By its very existence, voluntarism enhances the quality of life of those who served as well as of those who are served. It strengthens the community as a community because, whatever else may be said and done, it is a visible and lasting reminder that even in a world, and at a time, torn by strife and mistrust and often seemingly lubricated mainly by various forms of greed, millions of people care enough about each other and about the nation to give of their time and energy in service of better tomorrows.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Americans Volunteer, 1974, ACTION, Washington, D.C., February, 1975, esp., page 3.

[2] *Ibid*, page 4.
Also: *Americans Volunteer*, U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Washington, D.C., April, 1969.

[3] *Ibid*, esp., page 25, Table 5, Appendix C.

[4] In our study in Pittsburgh SMSA, now being reported, we have both allowed for responses to an open-ended "reasons" question as well as to structured questioning which contained many more options than did the Bureau of Census/ACTION instrument.

[5] *Op. cit.*, Table 8, page 26, Appendix C.

[6] See our study of motivations now in reporting stage.

[7] *Op. cit.*, Table 13, page 29, Appendix C.

[8] *Op. cit.*, Table 16, page 30, Appendix C.

[9] *Ibid*, esp., Table 12, page 28, Appendix C.

[10] *Ibid*, esp., page 1.

[11] *Op. cit.*, Table 18, page 31, Appendix C.

[12] For the remaining respondents, the Bureau of the Census deleted geography-specific identifiers (though not state residence). At the SMSA level of disaggregation, we could therefore deal with only these 12,768 respondents.

[13] New York SMSA here does not include Nassau and Suffolk Counties (as does the broad delineation of the New York SMSA by the Bureau of the Census). In the ACTION data base, Nassau and Suffolk form one of the 106 "identifiable" SMSA's in addition to the "rest of" New York SMSA.

[14] The Pearson product-moment correlation between percentages of volunteers and average hours each volunteer had spent for the 106 SMSA's turns out to be $r = -.058$ - of course, also not significantly different from zero correlation.

[15] No assumption here is made about the time distribution. Thus, some of these volunteers may spend a great many hours on some of the volunteering occasions, and fewer hours on other occasions, and so on. We have no way of detailing this further.

[16] The standard of "necessity" or "preference" which is applied here has to do with the accomplishability of the program's objectives: what, in terms of volunteer numbers, regularities and hours per volunteer would it take to get the job done.

CE 008 681